DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 117 CE 050 610

AUTHOR Bailis, Lawrence Neil
TITLE The More Things Change...A Study of the Status of PY 85 JTPA Coordination and PY 84 JTPA Program Activities. Research Report Series.
INSTITUTION National Commission for Employment Policy (DOL), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO NCEP-RR-87-25
PUB DATE Mar 87
NOTE 100p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; Comparative Analysis; *Coordination; *Employment Programs; Employment Services; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; *Job Training; Literature Reviews; Program Implementation; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; *Job Training Partnership Act 1982

ABSTRACT

A study documented and assessed changes in patterns of service delivery that followed the implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982 (JTPA). It focused specifically on the kinds of training activities and services that have been implemented and the degree to which they have been coordinated with related programs. Two complementary approaches were used: review of the JTPA implementation research literature and conduct of "panel studies." Data were collected from 45 prime sponsors during the last full year of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) and 45 JTPA service delivery areas (SDAs). Comparisons of activities funded under CETA and JTPA revealed that the typical prime sponsor/SDA spent fewer funds per client under JTPA, the typical SDA spent larger proportions of its funding on class-sized vocational skills training and on-the-job training under JTPA than under CETA, and there have not been appreciable changes in the kinds of training offered. The most striking study results in the area of coordination involved the absence of change in coordination that has followed the transition from CETA to JTPA. A number of important issues were raised: causes and results of reductions in participant costs, a decline in service to youth, absence of progress in implementing customized training courses, and lack of increases in coordination. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297117

THE MORE THINGS CHANGE...

A STUDY OF THE STATUS OF PY 85 JTPA COORDINATION AND PY 84 JTPA PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

by

Lawrence Neil Ballis

March 1987 RR-87-25

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES
NATIONAL COMMISSION
FOR EMPLOYMENT POLICY
1522 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CE050610

This paper contains a summary and analysis of information provided by the staff of 45 CETA Prime Sponsors and 45 JTPA Service Delivery Areas (SDAs), and would not have been possible without the willingness of these staff members to devote time and effort to this endeavor while facing major pressing management challenges.

Assistance in planning for the study and in techniques in data processing and analysis was provided by Howard Bloom of New York University and Abt Associates. John Wallace and Ev Crawford of the National Commission for Employment Policy provided both broad and detailed oversight for all aspects of the study. Despite this assistance, the opinions expressed in this paper are solely those of the author, and do not necessarily represent the official views of the National Commission for Employment Policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

5.0 FINDINGS OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW RELATIVE TO JTPA COORDINATION

5.1	Introduction and Overview	59
5.2	Overall Patterns of Coordination	59
5.3	Coordination with the Employment Service	62
5.4	Coordination with Welfare Agencies	65
5.5	Coordination with Public Education Agencies	65
5.6	Coordination with Economic Development Agencies	66
5.7	Coordination with Vocational Rehabilitation	68
5.8	Coordination between Titles IIA and III	68

6.0 POLICY AND RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

6.1	Introduction and Overview	69
6.2	Policy Implications Relative to JTPA Activities	69
6.3	Policy Implications Relative to JTPA Coordination	72
6.4	Research Implications	73

Appendix A: SUMMARY OF COORDINATION REQUIREMENTS IN JTPA AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR THIS STUDY A-1

Appendix B: DETAILED STUDY METHODOLOGY B-1

Appendix C: SOURCES CONSULTED C-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction and Overview 1
1.2 Policy Context 2
1.3 The Study Rationale 3
1.4 Methodology for the Panel Study 5
1.5 Methodology for Preparing Review Essays 6
1.6 Organization of This Report 11

2.0 HIGHLIGHTS OF THE FINDINGS OF THE PANEL STUDY RELATIVE TO PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

2.1 Introduction and Overview 13
2.2 Patterns of Service Delivery under JTPA 13
2.3 Changes in Patterns from CETA to JTPA 19

3.0 HIGHLIGHTS OF FINDINGS OF THE PANEL STUDY RELATIVE TO PROGRAM COORDINATION

3.1 Introduction and Overview 31
3.2 Current (PY 85) Status of Coordination 31
3.3 Changes in Coordination 37

4.0 FINDINGS OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW RELATIVE TO JTPA ACTIVITIES

4.1 Introduction and Overview 45
4.2 The JTPA Service Mix: Continuity, Change and Diversity 45
4.3 Analyses of Specific Activities 49
4.4 The JTPA Service Delivery System 55

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 Introduction

This paper has been prepared to document and assess the changes in patterns of service delivery that followed the early implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act of of 1982 (JTPA), focusing specifically on (a) the kinds of training activities and services that have been implemented, (b) the degree to which they have been coordinated with related programs.

Two complementary approaches have been employed: (a) review of the JTPA implementation research literature, and (b) conduct of "panel studies" on these topics that have involved:

- Development of generic descriptions of employment and training activities and coordination that are applicable to both CETA Prime Sponsors and JTPA Service Delivery Areas (SDAs);
- Utilization of the measures to describe the pre-JTPA ("baseline") activities funded by a random sample of Prime Sponsors in Fiscal 1983 and that status of coordination at that time;
- Utilization of the same measures in the first full year of JTPA (PY 1984) in order to discover and document changes in activities and in the second full year (PY 1985) to assess changes in coordination in the Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) that covered the same geographic jurisdictions as the initial random sample of Prime Sponsors; and
- Analysis of the results to determine the degree to which JTPA has brought about the kinds of changes that were anticipated when it was enacted and have thus far been described in the literature.

Useful information was supplied by forty-five of the fifty Prime Sponsors in the CETA sample (a 90% response rate) and forty-five of the fifty-one SDAs that represented the best match with these Prime Sponsors (representing a 88% response rate). Comparisons of the two programs were restricted to jurisdictions that provided useful information for both programs.

2.0 The Changing Legislative Framework

The framers of the Job Training Partnership Act had clear ideas about the ways in which CETA had failed, and therefore changed the "rules of the game" to prohibit certain of these perceived failings, to discourage others of them, and to promote changes that would overcome still others.

In short, they expected that the stress on program performance, the increased role of the local business community and their efforts to cut back on or eliminate PSE, work experience, supportive services and administration would result in a program that was more targeted on the needs of employers, more cost effective, and better coordinated with related programs. This study has been conducted to determine the extent to which these desired changes have begun to take place.

3.0 Highlights of Findings about Activities

Comparisons of the activities funded under CETA and JTPA reveal that:

- The typical Prime Sponsor/SDA* spent less funds per client under JTPA than was the case under CETA, with a decline in the median cost per client of 19.9%. The decline in median cost per on-the-job training (OJT) client (42.0%) was roughly twice that of the decline for classroom vocational skills training (CST) client (19.4%).

---

* Although the term "Prime Sponsor/SDA" is the most accurate one that could be used in referring to the sites for which before-after comparisons are made, this study will hereafter call them "SDAs" in the interest of improving readability.

- The typical SDA spent larger proportions of its funding on CST and OJT under JTPA than it did under CETA.

- The typical CST participant received a much shorter training course under JTPA than his or her counterpart under CETA and the typical OJT participant had a shorter contract. The CST decline in class-hours was roughly one quarter; the OJT decline in weeks was about one-fifth.

- There have not been any appreciable changes in the kinds of training offered; the JTPA emphasis for CST and OJT was still overwhelmingly on entry level jobs, and the JTPA occupational mix for CST closely resembled the mix under CETA. OJT training under JTPA may be more oriented to clerical, sales, and structural occupations.

Comparative analysis of the CETA and JTPA service delivery systems reveals that:

- There have been major increases in the proportion of subcontractors funded under performance-based contracts, and the use of competency measures to assess the progress of youth through employment and training activities.

- There has been a decline in the proportion of youth beings served in activities specifically designed for youth, with the median proportion declining from 82.7% under CETA to 64% under JTPA.

- There has been no increase in the proportion of CST courses that have been "customized" to meet the needs of individual employers.

4.0 Highlights of Findings on Coordination

SDAs generally perceive coordination with relevant public and private organizations to be both "good" and improving. However, they have made limited use of many of the planning and operational mechanisms that are considered to be useful to achieving the benefits of coordination.

There are numerous indications that JTPA SDAs have better coordination with the Employment Service than with any other public agency or program. At the other extreme, coordination with the WIN and WIN Demo programs is consistently at or near the bottom of the list.

Coordination with the other agencies is good on some measures and poor on others. The major conclusion that can be drawn from the data is that "coordination" is a complex and multidimensional concept, and that one should use extreme caution in generalizing.

The most striking study results involve the absence of change in coordination that has followed the transition from CETA to JTPA. In two-thirds or more of the SDAs, a simple rule can be used for predicting whether or not any given form of coordination is present under JTPA:

- If it was present under CETA, it will still be present and
- If it was not present under CETA, it will not be present.

Where changes are present, increases in coordination have tended to outnumber decreases. The positive developments documented by the study include an increase in the input that other agencies have into SDA planning, and greater utilization of formal referral agreements, joint funding of programs, and contracting for the provision of classroom vocational skills training. Notable increases in coordination can be found with the vocational rehabilitation and WIN programs.

On the other hand, there is little evidence of improved coordination with the Employment Service. In fact, there are numerous examples of backsliding, instances in which coordination has declined following the implementation of JTPA.

5.0 Policy and Research Implications

5.1 Policy Implications Relative to Activities

It is difficult to determine the policy implications of changes in activities funded under employment and training programs without supplementary data that addresses the type of clients being served, local labor market conditions, and the outcomes of service delivery. However, the study results suggest that several intended outcomes of the framers of JTPA have come to pass while limited progress appears to have occurred with respect to others.

SDAs are allocating a higher proportion of their total resources to classroom vocational skills training and on-the-job training, but they are doing so at a lower cost per participant than had been the case under CETA. Further information about the causes and results of these reductions in cost per client must be obtained before any unambiguous policy implications can be drawn.

Similarly, it seems clear that classroom skills training (CST) courses are shorter under JTPA than they were under CETA, and that OJT contracts cover fewer weeks. It is not clear whether these changes are resulting in greater efficiency or greater pressure to "cream"--or both.

The limited changes that have occurred in the occupations for which CST and OJT take place may mean that the priorities under CETA made sense, or that the changes brought about by JTPA have not been able to overcome powerful barriers to change. Again more attention to these issues is needed before definitive conclusions are reached.

The increased use of competency measures for youth programs is a positive sign, but is perhaps counterbalanced by a decline in service to youth in components that have been designed to meet the specific needs of young people. However, neither competency measures nor the design of courses is a "bottom line" measure; the importance of these trends can only emerge as definitive data about the impact of JTPA on young people begins to emerge.

The increased use of performance-based contracts under JTPA holds out the promise of continued improvements in the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the program. But further data is needed about whether or not this funding mechanism may be having such perverse effects as promoting an inappropriate tendency to "cream" or reducing the ability of non-profit community-based organizations to compete for funding.

Finally, the absence of progress in implementing customized training courses suggests that heightened employer involvement in planning does not automatically translate itself into increased employer involvement in the design or operation of such courses, or in the ability to target them on the specific needs of employers.

5.2 Policy Implications Relative to Coordination

The results of the study demonstrate the difficulties inherent in promoting and maintaining increased coordination between employment and training and related public and private organizations. While changes in legislation at the federal level and a variety of steps taken at the state level have undoubtedly been helpful in this regard, they have not been not sufficient to insure the kinds of dramatic increases in coordination that many employment and training professional have hoped for.

Funding cutbacks in JTPA and related programs have increased SDA awareness of the potential benefits of coordination with other agencies. But the results of the study suggest that neither the federal nor the state support for coordination has been sufficient to convince large numbers of SDAs and other agencies that it is in both of their interests to take specific steps to promote coordination, and that coordination can help both of them to "look good" on whatever performance measures they may be using. Until they are convinced, rhetoric about the benefits of coordination will not be enough; once they are convinced, rhetoric will not be necessary.

5.3 Research Implications

Review of the results of this study and the process by which information was collected, tabulated, and analyzed confirms both the theoretical advantages of panel studies over consecutive cross-sectional analyses, and demonstrates that the approach is feasible at relatively modest costs. The study showed that it was possible to obtain relatively detailed information about the nature of activities funded and coordination in employment and training programs from understaffed SDAs at several points in time, thereby making it possible to trace: (a) trends that were taking place at specific sites, and (b) the characteristics of sites at which specific kinds of change were more or less likely to occur.

The study also illustrates the benefits of preparing review essays that summarize consensus and disagreements in the research literature on a topic-by-topic basis.

Validating a research approach does not, however, mean that it cannot be done better in the future. Should efforts be made to replicate the panel study approach, it would be wise to limit the scope of the inquiry, and utilize the resources that are freed-up to additional validation of information supplied by the SDAs.

Further thought is also needed about the degree to which review essays should be documented by detailed excerpts from the literature. Including the excerpts provides the reader with a basis for assessing the author's conclusions, but it does so at the price of creating long documents.

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

> First, we should bear in mind that JTPA reflects a very different public policy approach to job training. Commentators [at the Congressional hearings] frequently expressed their concerns in terms of comparisons to CETA which shows that people are learning how JTPA and CETA differ.
>
> --U.S. Sen. Dan Quayle, Letter of Transmittal for "Preliminary Oversight on the Job Training Partnership Act" (December, 1984)

> Now I think we have gotten CETA behind us far enough, but I think from a programmatic point of view, that it would probably be of interest to sort of look back and to see what kind of improvements we really have made from that program.
>
> --U.S. Sen. Dan Quayle, Senate Oversight Hearings on JTPA, July 2, 1985

1.1 Introduction and Overview

What kinds of services is the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) offering today, and how do they differ from those that were offered under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)? Has coordination among employment and training programs improved since JTPA replaced CETA? This paper presents the highlights of a series of studies conducted for the National Commission for Employment Policy and summarizes the available evidence on these issues.

During the years since the passage of the Job Training Partnership Act in 1982, there have been dozens of reports on one or more aspects of program implementation. But the JTPA implementation literature does not always provide clear, unambiguous answers to even the most simple questions. Given this situation, a two-pronged approach has been adopted:

- Compiling the results of major research studies into review essays that report results in a topic by topic format; and

- Summarizing the results of "panel study" in which information was collected from fifty randomly selected Prime Sponsors during the last full year of CETA, and parallel information collected from the JTPA Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) that covered the same jurisdictions during the first two full program years that the new program was in operation.

1.2 Policy Context

The framers of the Job Training Partnership Act had clear ideas about the ways in which CETA had failed, and therefore changed the "rules of the game" to prohibit certain of these perceived failings, to discourage others of them, and to encourage actions that would hopefully overcome still others. In general, they felt that the CETA program had not devoted sufficient resources to training, was not sufficiently focused on program performance, and had become unresponsive to the needs of local labor markets.

As a result of these beliefs, the framers of the Act took a number of steps to clearly distinguish the new program from its CETA predecessor. These included changing the planning process to minimize the role of the Federal government and enhance the roles of both state government and local business communities as represented in Private Industry Councils (PICs). In addition to this, local accountability for performance was highlighted through the requirement that performance measures be adopted and serve as the basis of incentive funding for the Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) that replaced Prime Sponsors as the unit of local planning and program administration.

Efforts to influence the nature of service delivery systems went beyond these changes, however. The framers of JTPA sought to emphasize training activities by prohibiting or discouraging alternative uses of program funds. Thus, for example, the Act specifically prohibits public service employment (PSE), limits the funding of support services and program administration to 30% of the total (considerably less than they were allocated under CETA), and discourages work experience by requiring that many of the expenses of this component be included in the 30% pool.

In short, the framers of the Act expected that the stress on program performance, the increased role of the local business community and the above-cited efforts to cut back on or eliminate PSE, work experience, and funding for supportive services and administration would result in a program that was more targeted on the needs of employers and more cost effective.

Those who drafted and enacted JTPA also felt that coordination between CETA and other employment and training programs was inadequate, and tried to design the new program in ways that would promote needed coordination.

In response to these concerns, the JTPA legislation contains numerous references to the need to coordinate as well as planning and operational mechanisms designed to insure that the needed coordination would in fact take place. Both the programs and measures of coordination that have been included in this study are based upon the stated intentions of Congress with respect to coordination, as spelled out in the Act.*

1.3 The Study Rationale

1.3.1 The Need for Empirical Research

It is one thing to change funding and oversight procedures and other "rules of the game", and another to modify the specific employment and training activities that are actually implemented at the local level. In fact, several early studies of CETA implementation stressed the fact that only limited changes from the local delivery systems that had been in place under MDTA and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (EOA) despite the fundamental changes in the authorizing legislation. Reasons for this continuity were said to include limited time for planning the new program, limited knowledge of alternative program models, a lack of alternative service deliverers and a pattern of incremental planning that would only permit limited change in any given year.**

In short, we cannot assume that the changes in legislation and regulations brought about by the enactment of JTPA have indeed had the kinds of impacts that were envisaged by those who were responsible for passage of the Act. It is by no means obvious that SDAs have improved upon the services offered by CETA Prime Sponsors, or that the implementation of JTPA has been more effective in promoting improved coordination than was the CETA program of the 1970s and its 1960s predecessors, the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP), and the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS).

---

* These requirements and their implications for the study are summarized in Appendix A to this paper.

** See, for example, The Implementation of CETA in Ohio in which Randall Ripley et al of the Ohio State Mershon Center conclude that "there is substantial evidence that Prime Sponsors as a whole have not made large changes in the plans", The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: Impact on People, Places, Programs--An Interim Report in which William Mirengoff and Lester Rindler of the National Academy of Sciences conclude that "most Prime Sponsors continued contracts with existing program operators for training, work experience, and service activities", and The Role of Community Based Organizations under CETA by Bailis et al of Urban Systems Research and Engineering that notes that the several delivery systems in place during the fourth year of CETA "still closely resemble the ...systems that were in operation prior to the passage of CETA" in more than half of the 22 Prime Sponsors where fieldwork was conducted.

1.3.2 Shortcomings of the Existing Literature

Given this situation, the only way to be sure about actual changes at the local level is to obtain empirical information about the situation before and after the implementation of JTPA. In recent years, a wide range of published research literature has addressed many of the issues that are central to this study, but the literature does not provide an adequate basis for assessing the changes brought about by the transition from CETA to JTPA for several reasons, including (a) reliance upon a limited number of SDAs and Prime Sponsors, (b) differences in the ways that issues are conceptualized and types of measures that are used, (c) lack of consensus on an appropriate pre-JTPA base year, (d) changes that are occurring as JTPA matures.

Limited Samples

With the exception of a few items on the Department of Labor's annual and quarterly reporting systems, most of the information available to answer these questions pertains to samples of SDAs rather than the universe. With the exception of the 194 SDA Quick Turnaround (QT) data, most findings in the JTPA implementation literature are based on site visits or mail/ telephone surveys of no more than several dozen SDAs.

None of the JTPA studies has included comprehensive data on the nature of CETA activities and coordination been obtained from the same jurisdictions as the JTPA activities and coordination. Therefore the inferences about changes brought about by JTPA have often been based upon comparisons of relatively small, independently chosen samples.

Different Emphases, Conceptual Frameworks, and Measures

With the exception of a few fundamental issues, it is unusual for even two major studies to provide in-depth analyses of the same question, or analyze it the same way. To cite just one example, analyses of changes in utilization of specific modes of training use such different different measures as (a) the proportion of SDAs offering a given service, (b) the proportion of enrollees with the service as an initial assignment, (c) the proportion of terminees who received the service, and (d) the proportion of funds allocated for a service.

Lack of Consensus on a Pre-JTPA Base Year and the Basis for Comparisons

Analyses of how things have changed since termination of the CETA program are complicated by legitimate differences of opinion about the appropriate bases against which comparisons should be made. What year is the best pre-JTPA year? Which titles of CETA should be included or excluded? How should one take the elimination of CETA Public Service Employment (PSE) into account?

Changes in the JTPA System

Finally, there appear to be significant changes going on in the JTPA system as it matures, but much of the "conventional wisdom" about the program is based upon the early JTPA implementation studies that covered the experience of the transition year, from October 1, 1983 to June 30, 1984.

1.3.3 Filling the Gaps

The National Commission for Employment Policy (NCEP) has been deeply involved in planning for JTPA and in monitoring the transition from CETA to JTPA. Developing a better understanding of the nature of Federally-funded employment and training activities has been a major concern of the Commission and this concern has led directly to the funding of the studies to compile and analyze the research literature as well as obtain new empirical information that would help to overcome the above-described gaps by conducting a "panel study" that obtains identical "before and after" information from a single sample of Prime Sponsors and SDAs. This report summarizes the results of these studies. The methodological approaches taken in each of them are summarized below.

1.4 Methodology for the Panel Study

The panel study approach is based upon collection and analysis of identical information on employment and training program activities and coordination from a random sample of Prime Sponsors/SDAs at two points in time: prior to and subsequent to the passage of JTPA. In particular, in incorporates four steps:

- Development of generic descriptions of employment and training activities and coordination that would be applicable to both CETA Prime Sponsors and JTPA Service Delivery Areas (SDAs);

- Utilization of the measures to describe the pre-JTPA ("baseline") activities funded by a random sample of Prime Sponsors in Fiscal 1983* and that status of coordination at that time;

---

* The passage of JTPA resulted in changes in the time periods for which employment and training programs were funded, and the ways that they were designated. Under CETA, programs were funded under a fiscal year (FY) basis, with fiscal years beginning on October 1, and ending September 30 of the following year. Under JTPA, the funding period was shifted to a program year (PY) which begins on July 1 and ends on June 30 of the following year. In addition to this, fiscal years were named for the calendar year in which they ended, while program years are named for the year in which they begin.

- Utilization of the same measures in the first full year of JTPA (PY 1984) in order to discover and document changes in activities and in the second full year (PY 1985) to assess changes in coordination in the Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) that covered the same geographic jurisdictions as the initial random sample of Prime Sponsors; and

- Analysis of the results to determine the degree to which JTPA has brought about the kinds of changes that were anticipated when it was enacted.

The Prime Sponsors and SDAs included in the study are listed in Exhibit 1-1 on the following page. As shown by the exhibit, a total of fifty-one SDAs were determined to represent the best possible match with the fifty Prime Sponsors that made up the original CETA sample. Thirty-two of the matches were perfect, in that the boundaries of the SDA were identical to those of the former CETA Prime Sponsorship.

The exhibit also shows that useful information was provided by forty-five of the fifty Prime Sponsors (representing a 90% response rate) and forty-five of the fifty-one SDAs (representing an 88% response rate). Useful data on both CETA and JTPA was provided by 38 of the Prime Sponsor/SDA pairs, representing just under three-quarters of the total.

This report presents the highlights of two companion reports that present a detailed picture of (a) the patterns of activities and coordination that have emerged in the early years of JTPA and (b) an analysis of the changes in activities and coordination that have followed implementation of the Act.*

1.5 Methodology for Preparing Review Essays

The approach utilized in the development of review essays has been a straightforward one, involving:

- Compilation of a comprehensive bibliography of JTPA implementation research findings,

- Designation of a limited number of topics relating to the activities undertaken by CETA Prime Sponsors and JTPA SDAs and their experiences with coordination,

---

* Further details about the methodologies for these studies can be found in Appendix B to this paper. Detailed study findings can be found in the reports: "Study of the Status of PY 85 JTPA Coordination and PY 84 JTPA Program Activities--Final Report Activities Study" and "Study of the Status of PY 85 JTPA Coordination and PY 84 JTPA Program Activities--Final Report Coordination Study". Both studies are dated April, 1987, and are available from the Commission.

Exhibit 1-1 (a)

PARTICIPATING PRIME SPONSORS

AND SERVICE DELIVERY AREAS

Type of CETA Prime Sponsor (FY 1983)	Corresponding SDA (PY 1985)	Perfect Match?
County		
1. Bucks (PA)	Bucks County Office of E&T	Yes
2. Bal. of Albany (NY)	Rensselaer/Schenectedy/Albany SDA**	No
3. Cape May (NJ)	JTPA Admin., Cape May Co.	Yes
4. Monmouth (NJ)	Monmouth Dept. of E&T*	Yes
5. Camden (NJ)	Camden Co. E & T Center*	No
6. Bal. of Essex (NJ)*	PIC of Essex County	Yes
7. Delaware (PA)	Del. County Office of E & T	Yes
8. Lake (FL)	Volusia-Lake-Flagler PIC	No
9. Bal. of Tarrant (TX)	Tarrant Co. Emp. & Training Off.	Yes
10. Webb (TX)	South Texas PIC	No
11. Cameron (TX)	Cameron County PIC	Yes
12. Trumbull (OH)*	PIC of Trumbull County	Yes
13. Livingston (MI)	WALTEC	No
14. Bal. of Hamilton (OH)	Hamilton County E & T Agency	Yes
15. McHenry (IL)	McHenry County PIC	Yes
16. Bal. of Lake (IL)	PIC of Lake County	Yes
17. Davis (UT)	Davis County Emp. & Training	Yes
18. Monterey (CA)	Monterey Co. Office of E & T	Yes
19. Santa Cruz (CA)	Santa Cruz Human Resource Agency	Yes
20. Bal. of Santa Clara (CA)	DSS, JTPA Admin.***	No
	NOVA*** (Code 81)	No
Balance of States		
21. West Virginia	PIC of Kanawha County	No
22. New Jersey	Sussex Warren JTPA	Yes
23. New Mexico	Gov's Office of Emp. & Training	Yes
24. Indiana	Southeastern Indiana PIC	Yes
25. Missouri	SEMO Private Industry Council	No
26. Arizona	Northern Ariz. Council of Gov'ts*	No

---

* Did not provide useful information for the study.

** New SDA covers three former prime sponsorships, two of which were in the previous study; SDA did not provide information.

*** Prime Sponsorship now covered by two SDAs.

Exhibit 1-1(b)

PARTICIPATING PRIME SPONSORS

AND SERVICE DELIVERY AREAS

(cont.)

Type of CETA Prime Sponsor (FY 1983)	Corresponding SDA (PY 1985)	Perfect Match?
Consortium		
27. Albany City (NY)	Rensselaer/Schenectedy/Albany**	No
28. New Bedford (MA)	Office for Job Partnerships	Yes
29. Broome/Tioga (NY)	Broome-Tioga Office of E & T	Yes
30. Suffolk (NY)	Suffolk Co. Dept. of Labor	Yes
31. Gulf Coast (MISS)	Gulf Coast Business Corporation	No
32. Montgomery (AL)	Office of E & T	No
33. Mid-Georgia (GA)	SDA # 7	Yes
34. CSRA (GA)	CSRA Emp. & Training Consortium	Yes
35. Capital Area (TX)	PIC of Austin/Travis County	No
	WBCO JTPA (Code 82)****	No
36. Madison (IL)	Mad. County Emp. & Training Dept.	Yes
37. Southwestern (IND)	Southwestern Indiana PIC	No
38. Michiana (IND)	St. Joseph Co. Job Training Prog.*	Yes
39. Muskegon (MICH)	Muskegon Dept. of E&T	Yes
40. Topeka (KA)*	SDA # 2	No
41. Tacoma/Pierce (WA)	Tacoma-Pierce Co. E & T Consortium	Yes
42. Bal. of Alameda (CA	Ala. Co. Training & Emp. Board*	No
City		
43. Scranton (PA)*	Scranton Lackawanna Human Dev't Agency	No
44. Newark (NJ)	Mayor's Office of E & T	Yes
45. Little Rock (ARK)	Little Rock JTPA	Yes
46. Cleveland (OH)	Cleveland Dept. of Hum. Resources	Yes
47. Detroit (MI)	Detroit E & T Department	Yes
48. St. Louis (MO)	St. Louis Agency on Training & Emp.	Yes
49. Long Beach (CA)	Long Beach Dept. of Comm. Dev't	Yes
50. Eugene (OR)*	Southern Willamette PIC	No

* Did not provide useful information for the study.

** New SDA covers three former prime sponsorships, two of which were in the previous study; SDA did not provide information.

****Capitol Area Training Consortium divided into two SDAs.

- Summarizing the findings of each study on a topic-by topic basis, and

- Comparing the results to try to understand the reasons why the studies sometimes come to different conclusions.

More than eighty studies were reviewed*, but the study drew most heavily upon the following fifteen:

- Alegria, Fernando L., Jr., and Jose Figueroa, Study of the JTPA Eight Percent Education Coordination and Grants Set-Aside and the Three Percent Set-Aside Training Program for Older Individuals, (Washington, D.C.: Center for Policy Research and Analysis of the National Governors' Association, March 1986), a study based on a survey of states with 37 respondents conducted between October and December 1985 (hereafter referred to in this essay as "Alegria and Figueroa 1986")

- Brady, Elaine et al, What's Happening with JTPA? A Complete Analysis of NAB's 1984 Survey Data , a study based on a mail survey of all SDAs with 576 responses (97 percent of the 593 SDAs) conducted in July-September 1984, and telephone survey of 83 PIC chairs conducted July-September 1984 (hereafter referred to as "NAB 84")

- Brady, Elaine et al, Is the Job Training Partnership Act Working? The 1985 NAB Survey of PIC Chairs and SDA Administrators, a study based on a telephone survey with responses from 322 Private Industry Council chairs and 329 service delivery area administrators conducted in October-December 1985 (hereafter referred to as "NAB 1985")

- Cook, Robert, et al Early Service Delivery Area Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act (Rockville, MD: Westat, 1984), a study based on field visits to twenty-two SDAs during February-March 1984 (hereafter referred to in this essay as "Cook 84")

- Cook, Robert, et al Transition Year Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act (Rockville, MD: Westat, 1985), a study based on field visits to forty SDAs during June-August 1984 (hereafter referred to as "Cook 85")

- Cook, Robert, et al Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act: Final Report (Rockville, MD: Westat, 1985), a study based on field visits to forty SDAs during May and June, 1985, covering the first nine months of program year 1984 (hereafter referred to as "Cook 85A")

---

* A full list of all sources that were reviewed is contained in Appendix C to this report.

- Comptroller General of the United States, Job training Partnership Act: Initial Implementation of Program for Disadvantaged Youth and Adults (Washington: General Accounting Office, March 4, 1985), a study based field visits to fifteen SDAs during October 1984 to February 1985 (hereafter referred to as "GAO 85")

- Comptroller General of the United States, The Job Training Partnership Act: An Analysis of Support Cost Limits and Participant Characteristics (Washington: General Accounting Office, November 6, 1985), a study based on analysis of participant data from 148 SDAs, a survey of 594 SDAs, and field visits to eleven SDAs that were completed between May and December, 1984 (hereafter referred to as "GAO 85A")

- Nightingale, Demetra Smith and Carolyn Taylor O'Brien, Community-Based Organizations in the Job Training Partnership Act (Washington: The Urban Institute, October, 1984), a study based on a review of the relevant literature, interviews with 12 national employment and training policy and CBO leaders, and a telephone survey of 40 local independent community based organizations (hereafter referred to as "Nightingale 1984")

- Nightingale, Demetra Smith, Federal Employment and Training Policy Changes During the Reagan Administration: State and Local Responses (Washington: Urban Institute, May, 1985), a study based on review of the available literature, "telephone and in person discussions with Federal, state, and local officials in eleven states in September 1982 and May 1983, and and "structured interviews" in four communities in the summer of 1983 (hereafter referred to as "Nightingale 85")

- Richardson, Philip et al, Assessment of the Implementation and Effects of the JTPA Title V Wagner-Peyser Amendments: Phase I Final Report (Silver Spring, MD: Macro Systems, Inc., January, 1985), a study based on field visits to 16 states and 31 SDAs conducted in August-September 1984 (referred to as "Macro 84")

- Solow, Katherine, The Job Training Partnership Act Service to Women (New York: Grinker, Walker and Associates, 1986), a study based on field interviews and data collection at 25 SDAs and telephone interviews with 32 additional SDAs during an unspecified time period (hereafter referred to as "Solow 86")

- Walker, Gary, et al, An Independent Sector Assessment of the Job Training Partnership Act--Phase I: The Initial Transition (New York: Grinker-Walker & Associates, et al, March 1984), a study based on field visits to 25 SDAs and 15 states, telephone interviews with 32 additional SDAs, and telephone interviews with state officials in all 50 states conducted in October-December 1983 (hereafter referred to as "Walker 84")

- Walker, Gary, et al, An Independent Sector Assessment of the Job Training Partnership Act--Phase II: The Initial Implementation (New York: Grinker-Walker & Associates, et al, January 1985), a study based on field visits to 25 SDAs and 15 states, telephone interviews with 32 additional SDAs, and telephone interviews with state officials in all 50 states conducted in June and July of 1984 (hereafter referred to as "Walker 85")

- Walker, Gary et al, An Independent Sector Assessment of the Job Training Partnership Act--Final Report: Program Year 1985 (New York: Grinker Associates, July 1986), a study based on field visits to 25 SDAs and 15 states, and telephone interviews with 32 additional SDAs, conducted in 1985 (hereafter referred to as "Walker 86")

In order to promote comparisons with CETA, the review concentrated almost exclusively on the "block grant" Title IIA portion of JTPA, and includes references to Title III only as they relate to types of services offered and coordination with Title IIA.

This process resulted in a hundred page review essay that contains extensive quotations from each of the relevant sources.* This report contains the highlights of the longer paper, along with a less comprehensive set of excerpts from the literature.

1.6 Organization of This Report

The results of the panel study with respect to program activities are summarized in Chapter Two of this report. Chapter Three contains the panel study findings with respect to coordination. Chapters Four and Five contain the highlights of the findings of the literature reviews on activities and coordination respectively. Finally, Chapter Six presents the implications of the study findings for policy-makers and researchers.

---

* The longer paper is entitled, "Review Essay: Summary of the JTPA Research Literature Pertaining to SDA Activities and Coordination", dated April 1987, and is available from the Commission upon request.

Chapter Two

HIGHLIGHTS OF FINDINGS OF THE PANEL STUDY RELATIVE TO PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

2.1 Introduction and Overview

It is difficult to generalize about the diverse trends in service delivery that followed the transition from CETA to JTPA. However, three overall patterns seem to be emerging: (a) continuity in many areas, such as the types of classroom skills training (CST) and on-the-job training (OJT) that are offered, (b) efforts to streamline activities in ways that reduce the overall cost per client, and (c) increased implementation of such management mechanisms as performance-based contracts and competencies for youth-oriented programming. These trends are discussed in greater detail below, following an overview of the patterns of service delivery that were observed for JTPA Program Year 1984.*

2.2 Patterns of Service Delivery under JTPA

Total Funding Levels and Numbers of Participants

Review of the overall patterns of funding and participation in JTPA Title IIA activities in Program Year 1984 reveals that the average cost per client served was in the neighborhood of $ 1800 and $ 1900. These costs per client were lower than had been planned because SDAs tended to underspend Title IIA money but still managed to serve approximately the same number of clients that they had planned to serve.

Classroom Vocational Skills Training (CST)

As is shown in Exhibit 2-1 on the following page, information supplied by Service Delivery Areas about their classroom vocational skills training courses (CST) in Program Year 1984 yields several noteworthy conclusions:

- SDAs were severely underspending for this component, only managing to spend two of every three dollars allocated for CST (median value 63.3%).

---

* JTPA patterns are based on all SDAs that provided information on each topic; analyses of trends are based only on those Prime Sponsors/SDAs that provided information for both CETA and JTPA.

Exhibit 2-1

OVERVIEW OF CLASSROOM VOCATIONAL SKILLS TRAINING

UNDER JTPA (PY 84)

	Mean	Median	(n)*
Funds Allocated (000s)	$ 1,403	$ 457	31
Actual Expenditures (000s)	694	308	26
Participants	703	248	31
Alloc. per Participant	$ 2412	$ 1843	27
Expend. per Participant	$ 1645	$ 1271	24
Proportion of SDA's Title IIA Allocation Devoted to Classroom Skills Training	30.1%	26.6%	29
Proportion of SDA's Title IIA Participants Receiving Classroom Skills Training	28.2%	24.9%	28
Proportion of Slots for Entry Level Training	96.5%	100%	33
Length of Courses (in weeks)	21.2	20.5	28
Hours per Week	28.7	30.0	26
Total Length of Courses (classroom hours)	567	534	26

* Number of SDAs providing usable information on this topic.

- SDAs varied considerably in the degree to which they invested in CST, but in general this component consumed about a quarter of the Title IIA resources in the SDAs providing information on this topic (median value 26.6%) and was received by a similar proportion of all Title IIA participants (24.9%).

- Virtually all CST was directed at entry level jobs (a mean value of 96.5% of the slots and a median of 100%).

- The typical CST participant in the typical SDA took a course that was 534 hours in length, with an median commitment of 30.0 hours per week for 20.5 weeks.

Other relevant facts about classroom skills training in Program Year 1984 include the following:

- A majority of CST slots in the typical SDA were either in the clerical and sales fields (41%) or the professional and technical fields (20%).

- The most popular patterns of service delivery were subcontracts to public secondary schools (present in 69.0% of the SDAs providing information on this topic) and private proprietary schools (present in 65.8%). In-house delivery of this type of training was infrequent.

On-the-Job Training (OJT)

Exhibit 2-2 on the following page summarizes the information provided by SDAs about the on-the-job training (OJT) activities that they undertook in Program Year 1984. Highlights of the exhibit include the following:

- SDAs varied considerably in the allocation of funds to OJT, but overall it consumed about a sixth of the Title IIA resources (median value 14.3%) and was received by a similar proportion of the Title IIA participants (16.9%).

- The average OJT contract lasted about 20 weeks (mean length was 20.4 weeks and median length was 18.3 weeks).

- Nearly all the slots were for entry level positions.

- Almost all of the SDAs used a 50% subsidy rate for all OJT slots.

Other relevant study findings about this component include:

- Nearly half of the OJT slots were either in service occupations (27%) or clerical and sales (19%).

- The dominant pattern of service delivery was in-house negotiation and oversight of at least some OJT contracts by SDA staff.

Exhibit 2-2

OVERVIEW OF ON THE JOB TRAINING UNDER JTPA (PY 84)

	Mean	Median	(n)*
Funds Allocated (000s)	$ 499	$ 275	25
Actual Expenditures (000s)	354	164	23
Participants	414	173	31
Cost per Participant	$ 1162	$ 1000	22
Proportion of SDA's Title IIA Allocation Devoted to OJT	17.8%	14.4%	23
Proportion of SDA's Title IIA Participants Receiving OJT	20.8%	16.9%	28
Length of Contracts (in weeks)	20.4	18.3	22
Contract Wage	$ 4.63	$ 4.76	19
Size of Subsidy	49.6%	50 %	21
Proportion of Slots for Entry Level OJT	97.3%	100%	29

* Number of SDAs providing usable information.

Other Training Activities and Services in PY 84

The full text of the companion report on program activities provides information about funding levels and numbers of participants involved in such other training activities and services as prevocational programs, work experience-related programming, intake and assessment services, placement-related services, and supportive services.

The JTPA Service Delivery System

Review of information about the Program Year 1984 JTPA service delivery systems provided by SDAs indicates that:

- SDAs made heavy use of performance-based contracts, especially for their classroom vocational skills training service deliverers. More than half (56.3%) used this mechanism for all CST service deliverers, as compared with just over a quarter (29.0%) that used it for all other service deliverers.

- Nearly nine-tenths of the SDAs providing information on trends in the utilization of PIC-approved competency measures (89.2%) planned to have at least some measures in place for their youth programs in Program Year 1985; this can be compared with about two-thirds (64.9%) in the prior program year.

- A majority of youth were served in activities designed specifically for youth (the mean proportion was 50.1% and the median was 61.0%).

- Fewer than half of the SDAs had even one customized training course, but about three-fourths reported employer input into the design of the curriculum of at least one of their courses. (See exhibit 2-3).

- Nearly all SDAs (85.1%) conducted client followup.

Client Flow Terminology

Efforts to compare performance among SDAs are often hampered by differences in the way they use key terms. The study revealed that there is considerable variation in the ways that SDAs define such terms as "enrollment" and "termination". The most common definition of enrollment involved clients who had been assessed and assigned to an activity (47.3% of the SDAs) and having spent at least one day at a training activity (21.1%).

The most common definitions of termination involved the passage of days after completing (or dropping out of) a training activity (73.%). Within this group, ninety days was far and away the most popular cut-off point; over half of the SDAs (54.1%) considered a client a terminee after 90 days had passed since the client completed a training component or dropped out.

Exhibit 2-3

PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN THE DESIGN AND DELIVERY OF CLASSROOM TRAINING COURSES

	No Courses	Some Courses	All Courses	Average Proportion of Courses
Classroom vocational skills training courses that:				
A. Are "customized" to meet the needs of individual employers (n=33)*	18 (54.5%)	13 (39.4%)	2 (6.1%)	12.9%
B. Are funded at least in part with "private sector matching" funds (n=30)	21 (70%)	8 (26.7%)	1 (3.3%)	11.0%
C. Have employer input into the curriculum (n=29)	7 (24.1%)	11 (37.9%)	11 (37.9%)	50.6%
D. Have employer input into the selection of trainees (n=28)	14 (50.0%)	13 (46.4%)	1 (3.6%)	13.8%
E. Have employer input into the selection of instructors (n=30)	18 (60.0%)	11 (36.7%)	1 (3.3%)	11.1%
F. Have employer involvement in teaching courses (n=30)	14 (46.7%)	14 (46.7%)	2 (6.7%)	19.0%
G. Have regular visits to employer worksites (n=28)	13 (46.4%)	12 (42.9%)	3 (10.7%)	18.2%
H. Have all or part of training at employer worksites (n=29)	15 (51.7%)	13 (44.8%)	1 (3.4%)	10.8%

* n = number of SDAs providing information on this topic.

2.3 Changes in Patterns from CETA to JTPA

Overall Trends in Funding and Participation

The advent of JTPA resulted in declines in the levels of funding available to Prime Sponsors/SDAs for year-round basic employment and training activities for disadvantaged youth and adults.* As is illustrated in Exhibit 2-4 below, the JTPA funding levels range between three-quarters and nine-tenths of their CETA counterparts. On the other hand, the data suggest that SDAs have, in general, restructured programs in order to serve roughly the same number (or a somewhat greater) number of participants with this reduced level of funding. As a result of these two trends, there has been a sharp decline in the cost per client served following the transition to JTPA. The exhibit shows declines in the general neighborhood of 20% for the sample of all SDAs providing information on this topic and the subsample that maintained identical boundaries under CETA and JTPA.

Changes in Class-sized Vocational Skills Training Courses

Class-sized vocational skills training (CST) courses have always been central components of the major adult-oriented Federally-funded employment and training programs. As is illustrated in Exhibit 2-5a below, SDAs tended to devote less resources to CST under JTPA than they had done under CETA, and to serve fewer participants in this component. In general, the decreases in resources tended to be greater than the decreases in participants, resulting in a net decline in cost per participant in this component. The exhibit suggests that the decline is in the general neighborhood of 20% regardless of whether one uses the mean or the median as the indicator, and regardless of whether one uses the total sample of SDAs or only the subsample which maintained the same boundaries.

Exhibit 2-5b shows that the reductions in funding for CST were generally less severe than the overall decreases in funding that followed the transition to JTPA, yielding a net increase in the share of resources allocated to this function.* There are no clear patterns in terms of changes in proportion of participants receiving CST.

The exhibit also shows that the advent of JTPA did not result in any change in the SDAs' overwhelming preference for training in entry-level jobs. More than four out of every five Prime Sponsors/SDAs devoted all of their CST funds to training for entry level positions under both CETA (87.0%) and JTPA (82.6%).

---

* The comparisons discussed in this section are based on the total allocations for CETA in FY 83 minus the summer youth allocation, and the Title IIA allocation for JTPA PY 1984.

Exhibit 2-4

CHANGES IN OVERALL PATTERNS OF FUNDING
AND PARTICIPATION FROM CETA TO JTPA

		CETA	JTPA	Ratio
Funds Allocated to SDA (000s)*				
All SDAs (n=32)**	(mean)	$ 3708	$ 2830	.92 ***
	(median)	$ 2145	$ 2199	.78
SDAs with the same boundaries (n=23)	(mean)	$ 4212	$ 3058	.82
	(median)	$ 2499	$ 2198	.77
Participants in all activities				
All SDAs (n=23)*	(mean)	1588	1579	1.32
	(median)	1212	1324	1.03
SDAs with the same boundaries (n=15)	(mean)	1760	1722	1.13
	(median)	1214	1413	.94
Cost per Participant				Change
All SDAs (n=23)**	(mean)	2350	1836	-21.9%
	(median)	2329	1981	-19.9%
SDAs with the same boundaries (n=15)	(mean)	2450	1767	-27.9%
	(median)	2191	1981	- 9.6%

* Based on a comparison of all funding for the CETA Prime Sponsors in FY 1983 other than the summer youth funding, and the Title IIA funding for PY 1984 under JTPA.

** n = number of SDAs providing useful information on both CETA and JTPA on this topic. In all cases, the Alabama Governor's Unified Training Area (GUTA) has also been eliminated due to aberrant results, e.g., a change in boundaries resulting in a change in allocation from $ 2 million to $ 20 million.

*** Mean and median of the ratio of JTPA to CETA for each SDA.

Exhibit 2-5a

OVERVIEW OF CHANGES IN CLASSROOM VOCATIONAL SKILLS TRAINING FROM CETA (FY 83) TO JTPA (PY 84)

Funds Allocated to CST (000s)				
All SDAs (n=21)*	(mean)	$ 941	$ 870	- 7.5%
	(median)	$ 719	$ 461	-35.9%
SDAs with the same boundaries (n=15)	(mean)	$ 1056	$1052	- 0.4%
	(median)	$ 756	$ 619	-18.1%
Participants in CST				
All SDAs (n=20)*	(mean)	478	467	- 2.3%
	(median)	410	368	-10.2%
SDAs with the same boundaries (n=13)	(mean)	588	595	+ 1.2%
	(median)	467	398	-14.8%
Cost per Participant				
All SDAs (n=16)**	(mean)	2350	1816	-22.7%
	(median)	2141	1725	-19.4%
	(high)	4480	2815	-37.2%
	(low)	1079	1159	+ 7.4%
SDAs with the same boundaries (n=12)	(mean)	2409	1759	-27.0%
	(median)	2098	1715	-18.2%
	(high)	4484	2815	-37.2%
	(low)	1079	1167	+ 8.2%

---

* n = number of SDAs providing useful information on both CETA and JTPA on this topic. In all cases, the Alabama Governor's Unified Training Area (GUTA) has also been eliminated due to aberrant results, e.g., a change in boundaries resulting in a change in allocation from $ 2 million to $ 20 million.

** Also excludes an SDA that reported allocating $ 276,000 to train 22 individuals.

Exhibit 2-5b

OVERVIEW OF CHANGES IN CLASSROOM VOCATIONAL SKILLS TRAINING FROM CETA (FY 83) TO JTPA (PY 84)

Proportion of SDA's Title IIA Allocation Devoted to Classroom Skills Training (n=18)*	(mean)	.222	.299	+34.7%
	(median)	.198	.254	+28.3%
	(high)	.401	.753	+87.8%
	(low)	.050	.094	+88.0%
Proportion of SDA's Title IIA Participants Receiving Classroom Skills Training (n=12)*	(mean)	.269	.292	+ 8.6%
	(median)	.291	.229	-21.3%
	(high)	.487	.627	+28.7%
	(low)	.130	.127	- 2.3%
Proportion of Slots for Entry Level Training (n=23)**	(mean)	.974	.943	- 3.2%
	(median)	1.000	1.000	--
Number of SDAs with All Slots at Entry Level (n=23)**		20 (87.0%)	19 (82.6%)	- 4.4%
Length of Courses (in weeks) (n=18)**	(mean)	28.6	21.3	-25.5%
	(median)	26.0	21.4	-17.7%
Hours per Week** (n=18)	(mean)	29.7	28.8	- 3.0%
	(median)	30.0	30.0	--
Total Length of Courses (classroom hours) (n=18)**	(mean)	815	599	-26.5%
	(median)	841	615	-26.9%

---

* n = number of SDAs providing useful information on both CETA and JTPA on this topic. Excludes a CETA Balance of State subgrantee that allocated all of its funding to CST while other activities were funded at the state level.

** n = number of SDAs providing useful information on both CETA and JTPA on this topic.

As is also shown in the exhibit, the CST courses under JTPA involved considerably fewer classroom hours than their CETA predecessors. The mean number of classroom hours declined from 815 in the last full year of CETA to 599 in the first full year of JTPA, a decrease of 26.5%, and the median length of the courses declined by a similar proportion. Since CST courses averaged about thirty hours a week under both programs, the overall decline in classroom hours can be attributed primarily to a decline in the number of weeks the courses were offered.

The occupational distribution of CST positions did not change appreciably following the transition to JTPA. As is illustrated in Exhibit 2-6 below, there were moderate increases in the proportion of training slots allocated to professional and technical jobs and clerical and sales occupations in the typical SDA, and a moderate decline in machine and benchwork occupations.

The proportions of Prime Sponsors/SDAs that used community-based organizations (CBOs) and private proprietary schools to deliver at least one of their CST courses increased considerably following the transition to JTPA. At the other extreme, there was a decline in the utilization of skills centers for this purpose.

Changes in On-the-Job Training

The transition from CETA to JTPA brought about decreases in the absolute amount of funding that Prime Sponsors/SDAs allocated to OJT contracts, and increases in the number of participants assigned to the component. As a result, there was a sharp decline in the cost per participant for this activity. Exhibit 2-7 shows that the decline was in the neighborhood of one-third, i.e., a decrease of 32.3% in the mean cost per participant and a decrease of 42.0% in the median cost.

As was the case with classroom vocational skills training, the changes in funding and numbers of participants for OJT should be interpreted in the light of the overall changes in funding and participants among SDAs. The exhibit shows that the implementation of JTPA was followed by major increases in the proportion of resources assigned to OJT contracts, and the proportion of participants participating in this component at the typical SDA.

The advent of JTPA does not appear to have affected the size of OJT subsidies. As is also shown in the exhibit, the vast majority of Prime Sponsors/SDAs employed a 50% subsidy for all of their OJT slots under both programs. Only one of the twelve SDAs with information on both time periods did not adopt this level of subsidy for all OJT slots.

---

* These comparisons are based upon the ratio of all CST programs and total Prime Sponsor allocation for year-round activities under CETA, and the ratio of Title IIA CST and total Title IIA allocation under JTPA.

Exhibit 2-6

CHANGES IN AND PROPORTION OF CLASSROOM SKILLS TRAINING SLOTS BY OCCUPATION FROM CETA TO JTPA*

	Mean Number of Slots under CETA	Mean Number of Slots under JTPA	Change in Percentages
Clerical and Sales (20-29)**	139.9*** (37.8%)	169.6 (42.9%)	+ 5.1%
Machine Trades and Benchwork Occupations (60-79)	80.6 (21.8%)	63.9 (16.2%)	- 5.6%
All Professional and Technical (00-19)	48.7 (13.2%)	75.7 (19.2%)	+ 6.0%
Health-related only (07)	42.9 (11.6%)	44.2 (11.2%)	-0.6%
All Service (30-38)	43.7 (11.8%)	38.7 (9.8%)	- 2.0%
Food Service only (31)	2.6 (0.7%)	13.3 (3.4%)	+2.7%
Building Service only (38)	27.9 (7.5%)	20.2 (5.2%)	-2.3%
Structural Work Occupations (80-89)	19.4 (5.2%)	15.2 (3.8%)	- 1.4%
Other/various	38.1 (10.3%)	32.2 (8.1%)	- 2.2%
TOTAL	370.4	395.3	

* Based on the 13 SDAs that provided detailed information on occupational groupings for classroom vocational skills training under CETA (FY 83) and JTPA (PY 84).

** Numbers in parentheses are two digit DOT codes.

*** Entries represent the mean number of slots at each SDA.

Exhibit 2-7

OVERVIEW OF CHANGES IN ON-THE-JOB TRAINING
FROM CETA (FY 83) TO JTPA (PY 84)

(entries represent mean or median values
at SDAs providing information)

		CETA	JTPA	Change
Funds Allocated (000s) (n=19)	(mean)	$ 361.9	$ 358.7	- 0.9%
	(median)	$ 234.0	$ 194.0	-17.1%
Participants (n=22)	(mean)	257.2	341.1	+32.6%
	(median)	117.5	181.0	+54.0
Cost per Participant (n=18)	(mean)	$ 1790	$ 1212	-32.3%
	(median)	$ 1723	$ 1000	-42.0%
Proportion of SDA's Title IIA Allocation Devoted to OJT (n=18)	(mean)	.120	.174	+45.0%
	(median)	.098	.131	+33.7%
Proportion of SDA's Title IIA Participants Receiving OJT (n=12)	(mean)	.147	.247	+ 68.0%
	(median)	.097	.259	+167.0%
Number of contracts (n=8)**	(mean)	32.38	30.75	- 5.0%
	(median)	14.50	25.00	+72.4%
Length of Contracts (in weeks) (n=15)	(mean)	20.67	18.86	- 8.8%
	(median)	18.00	14.50	-19.4%
Size of Subsidy (n=12)	(mean)	49.8%	49.3%	- 1.0%
	(median)	50.0%	50.0%	--
Proportion of OJT Slots for Entry Level OJT (n=20)	(mean)	.981	.965	- 1.6%
	(median)	1.000	1.000	--

---

* Number of SDAs providing usable information. Where appropriate, information on the Alabama GUTA SDA has been excluded because of extreme changes resulting from increases in the SDA jurisdiction. As a result of these changes, funding for OJT increased from $ 218,000 to $ 1,946,000, and the number of participants increased from 193 to 2432. It should be noted that relatively small SDAs were more likely to provide detailed information about their individual OJT contracts.

** Also excludes an SDA that reported an increase from 64 to 800 OJT contracts.

Similarly, the implementation of JTPA does not appear to have had much impact on the prior CETA practice of devoting virtually all of the OJT activity to entry level slots. As is also shown in the exhibit, virtually all Prime Sponsors/SDAs devoted 100% of their slots to entry level positions both before and after JTPA. There were only six exceptions to this rule (out of 20 SDAs) under CETA, and only three exceptions (out of this same number) under JTPA.

Only six Prime Sponsors/SDAs were able to provide detailed descriptions of the occupations that their OJT slots were in both both the CETA and JTPA programs. Among those six, the transition to JTPA resulted in a relatively sharp reduction in the proportion of slots allocated to machine trades and benchmark jobs, and a notable increase in the proportion of slots allocated to clerical and sales positions and structural work occupations.

There has also been no major change in the organizational arrangements for the delivery of OJT services following the transition to JTPA. More than three-quarters of the Prime Sponsors/SDAs (76%) were writing all or some of the OJT contracts in-house under CETA, and precisely the same proportion retained this function under JTPA.

Changes in the Delivery of Other Training Activities and Services

The changes in the delivery of other training activities and services following the transition from CETA to JTPA are discussed in the full report on JTPA activities that is available from the Commission.

Changes in the Service Delivery System

During the final years of CETA, the Department of Labor had been encouraging Prime Sponsors to centralize such key "front end" and "back end" functions as intake and assessment on the one hand, and job development and placement on the other in order to make the system more efficient. Comparative analysis of the CETA and JTPA service delivery systems reveals that centralization has not increased following the transition to JTPA.

As is shown in Exhibit 2-8 on the following page, the number of service deliverers that the typical Prime Sponsor/SDA used for intake, job development, and support services remained roughly the same, and the number of service deliverers used for outreach increased somewhat.

Performance-based Contracts

Several aspects of JTPA were expected to promote increased utilization of performance-based contracts, such as the overall emphasis on program performance, and the provision which treats all funding for performance-based contracts as program, rather than administrative, monies.

Exhibit 2-8

CHANGES IN CENTRALIZATION OF
SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEMS

(number of service deliverers
carrying out specific functions)

Number of Deliverers	Number of SDAs	
	CETA	JTPA
Outreach (n=28)*		
Zero	1	1
One	19	14
Two	1	3
More than two	7	10
(Median)	(1)	(1)
Intake (n=30)		
One	23	24
Two	1	3
More than two	6	3
(Median)	(1)	(1)
Job development/ placement (n=28)		
Zero	1	1
One	9	10
Two	2	5
More than two	16	12
(Median)	(4)	(2)
Support services (n=24)		
Zero	0	3
One	15	14
Two	0	0
More than two	9	7
(Median)	(1)	(1)

* n = number of SDAs providing useful information on this topic for both CETA and JTPA.

As is shown in Exhibit 2-9, these emphases have apparently borne fruit. The proportion of SDAs utilizing performance-based contracts has risen sharply for both class-sized vocational skills training courses and other activities, with the greatest increases in the former case. The proportion of Prime Sponsors/ SDAs utilizing performance-based contracts for all class-sized training programs rose from about one in six under CETA (17.9%) to one out of every two (50.0%), and the median proportion of CST deliverers on this kind of contract rose from 10.6% to 94.7%.

Programming for Youth

As is shown in Exhibit 2-10 below, the transition from CETA to JTPA resulted in a marked reduction in the proportion of youth being served in activities designed specifically to meet their own needs (as opposed to being served in programs open to adults and youth). This pattern is evident in all indicators included in the exhibit, but is most striking in the case of SDAs that decided to serve all youth in youth oriented programs. There were four such Prime Sponsors under CETA, and none of them maintained this policy under JTPA. One possible explanation for this decline is the fact that CETA had a separate funding title for youth programs, while JTPA does not. (Many of the CETA Prime Sponsors were operating under "consolidated" titles during the last year of the program, but chose to maintain much of their previous Title IV programming under the "consolidated" title.)

The efforts to promote the use of competency measures in youth oriented programming that began late in the CETA years have clearly borne fruit under JTPA. As is also shown in the exhibit, there have been clear increases in the proportion of youth oriented programs using competencies since the implementation of JTPA. The median proportion of youth oriented activities that use competency measures to assess client progress rose from 0 in the median Prime Sponsor under CETA to 23.7% under JTPA in Program year 1984 and was expected to rise to 83.5% the following year.

Other Aspects of the Service Delivery System

Under CETA, many clients received "packages" of services, i.e., two of more related services received either simultaneously or in sequence. For example, clients sometimes received prevocational training before vocational skills training, or work experience prior to job search assistance. There was a slight decline in the proportion of clients receiving such service packages following the transition from CETA to JTPA, with the median dropping from 20.0% to 16.6%.

Finally, it appears that the increased emphasis on employer involvement in the design and implementation of training programs under JTPA did not appear to result in an increase in "customizing" training courses to meet the needs of a single employer. The median proportion of CST courses that were customized was very low under both CETA and JTPA, dropping from 9.0% under the former program to 2.5% under the latter.

Exhibit 2-9

CHANGES IN UTILIZATION OF
PERFORMANCE-BASED CONTRACTS

		CETA	JTPA	(Change)
Proportion of class-sized vocational skills training service delivers on performance-based contracts* (n=28)**	None	13 (46.4%)	3 (10.7%)	-35.7%
	All	5 (17.9%)	14 (50.0%)	+32.1%
	50% or more	8 (28.6%)	20 (71.4%)	+42.8%
	Mean	.288	.716	+ .428
	Median	.106	.946	+ .840
Proportion of other service deliverers on performance-based contracts* (n=23)**	None	16 (69.6%)	5 (21.7%)	-47.9%
	All	2 (8.7%)	7 (30.4%)	+21.7%
	50% or more	5 (21.7%)	14 (60.1%)	+38.4%
	Mean	.169	.598	+ .429
	Median	.000	.800	+ .800

---

* Includes all titles under CETA and Title IIA only under JTPA.

** n = number of SDAs providing useful information on this topic for both CETA and JTPA.

Exhibit 2-10

CHANGES IN PROGRAMMING FOR YOUTH

		CETA	JTPA	(Change)
Proportion of youth served in activities that are designed specifically for youth (n=23)*	None	2 (8.7%)	2 (8.7%)	--
	All	4 (17.4%)	0 ---	- 17.4%
	50% or more	20 (87.0%)	13 (56.5%)	- 30.5%
	Mean	.732	.520	- .212
	Median	.827	.640	- .187

		CETA	JTPA (PY84)	JTPA (PY85)
Proportion of youth-oriented activities that use competency measures to assess participant progress (n=14)**	None	8 (57.1%)	5 (35.7%)	0 ---
	All	2 (14.3%)	2 (14.3%)	7 (50.0%)
	50% or more	3 (21.4%)	4 (28.6%)	10 (71.4%)
	Mean	.254	.333	.699
	Median	.000	.237	.835

* n = the number of SDAs providing useful information on this topic for both CETA and JTPA.

**n = the number of SDAs providing useful information on this topic for CETA and for both PY 84 and PY 85 under JTPA.

Chapter 3

HIGHLIGHTS OF FINDINGS OF THE PANEL STUDY RELATIVE TO PROGRAM COORDINATION

3.1 Introduction and Overview

Analysis of information provided by SDAs indicates that there has been relatively little change in subjective or objective measures of coordination following the transition from CETA to JTPA. The patterns of coordination in the second full year of JTPA are remarkably similar to those that were encountered in the same jurisdictions in the last year of CETA. Although patterns tend to differ from one measure of coordination to the next, SDA coordination with the Employment Service tends to be at the highest levels, and coordination with welfare agencies and WIN/WIN Demo programs tends to be at the lowest.*

3.2 Current (PY 85) Status of Coordination

Perceived Levels of Coordination

When asked to describe coordination with other agencies as non-existent, minimal, good, or excellent, the typical JTPA SDA administrative entity director (or his or her designee) chose the term "good". Using a rating scale in which these four levels of coordination were assigned scores of 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively, the mean score for all SDAs and all nine agencies was 2.97. As is shown in Exhibit 3-1 on the following page, the highest perceived levels of coordination were experienced with private employers (with an average score of 3.30) and the public Employment Service (3.08). SDA representatives gave considerably lower ratings to coordination with the WIN and WIN Demo programs (2.56) than with any other agencies or programs, with the exception of Title III programs operated by agencies other than SDAs.

The responses with respect to WIN and WIN Demo merit further attention. Four of the 32 SDAs providing information on this issue described coordination with WIN as non-existent, and another 10 described it as minimal, yielding a total of 14 out of 32 (47%) who gave a rating of less than "good." In one of the four, coordination was nonexistent because there was no WIN program in the county; the SDA was considered too "remote" to have a WIN program.

---

* JTPA patterns are based on all SDAs that provided information on each topic; analyses of trends in coordination are based only on those SDAs that provided information for both CETA and JTPA.

Exhibit 3-1

PERCEIVED LEVELS OF COORDINATION*

Coordination with	All SDAs	Counties	Cities	PICs	States	NPOs**
Private Employers	3.30 (37)**	3.33 (18)	2.75 (4)	3.67 (6)	3.00 (3)	3.50 (4)
ES	3.08 (38)	3.00 (18)	3.20 (5)	3.00 (6)	3.00 (3)	3.25 (4)
Economic Development Agencies	2.97 (36)	3.00 (18)	3.33 (3)	3.00 (6)	2.33 (3)	2.75 (4)
Public Education Agencies	2.97 (38)	2.94 (18)	3.20 (5)	3.00 (6)	3.00 (3)	2.50 (4)
Vocational Education	2.95 (37)	2.84 (19)	3.25 (4)	3.00 (6)	3.33 (3)	2.75 (3)
Vocational Rehabilitation	2.95 (39)	3.10 (20)	2.75 (4)	3.00 (6)	2.33 (3)	3.00 (4)
Welfare	2.87 (38)	3.00 (20)	2.50 (4)	3.00 (5)	2.33 (3)	2.50 (4)
Proprietary Schools Agencies	2.79 (34)	2.73 (15)	2.25 (4)	3.17 (6)	2.67 (3)	2.75 (4)
WIN/ WIN Demo	2.56 (32)	2.44 (16)	2.25 (4)	3.25 (4)	3.00 (3)	2.25 (4)
MEAN SCORE FOR ALL AGENCIES	2.97 (41)	2.97 (20)	2.98 (5)	3.10 (6)	2.78 (3)	2.81 (4)

* Based on ratings in which 1 = non-existent
2 = minimal
3 = good
4 = excellent

** NPO = non-profit organizations.

*** Numbers in parentheses are the number of observations.

However, the other three represent instances in which WIN programs were in effect in the Service Delivery Area; they do not represent instances in which coordination was impossible because of the absence of a WIN or WIN Demo program. Comments of SDA officials at these sites include:

> It's almost like we're competing agencies. Whatever they do, it's a secret. There is duplication of services since we both serve welfare recipients...

> There is a no coordination with the WIN Demo program at all. Zero. The welfare department doesn't seem to feel the need to coordinate with us. They have so many clients that they can't figure out which agencies can be most helpful to each of them.

Perhaps most critically, there is considerable evidence that suggests that the referral process from welfare agencies to JTPA is not working particularly well. Roughly two-thirds of the welfare recipients served by the typical SDA that provided information on this topic were walk-ins, not referrals. Moreover, SDAs often question the appropriateness of the referrals that they do get from WIN/WIN Demo. Less than two-thirds of the SDAs (62.0%) report that WIN referrals are always, almost always, or usually appropriate.

Structures and Planning Procedures

There is a large number of planning procedures or structural reforms that agencies can adopt when they wish to improve coordination. The most popular involve developing mechanisms to provide input into each other's planning processes, quarterly or monthly meetings at which coordination can be discussed, the development of "umbrella agencies" whose leadership have line authority over the agencies to be coordinated, and assignment of uniform and contiguous service areas to two or more agencies.

As is shown in Exhibit 3-2 on the following page, these kinds of coordination are most frequently encountered with private employers, and take place least frequently with the WIN/WIN Demo and other welfare programs. Those who wish to promote coordination between JTPA and welfare employment programs cannot fail to be concerned with the fact that only about a third of the SDAs reported any planning input from the WIN/WIN Demo programs in their jurisdictions.

Operational Mechanisms to Coordinate Service Delivery

Both the research literature and common sense suggest that increasing coordination in the planning process may be useful; but it is the results of coordination that public policy-makers and administrators should be more concerned with. This study explored a wide range of operational mechanisms that are explicitly designed to coordinate service delivery in employment and training and related human service programs, including:

Exhibit 3-2

OVERVIEW OF PREVALENCE OF PLANNING AND OPERATIONAL COORDINATION MECHANISMS*

	Average for Five Planning Mechanisms	Average for Ten Operational Mechanisms
WIN/WIN Demo	.19	.13
Employment Service	.47	.30
Welfare Agencies	.28	.13
Vocational Education Agencies	.36	.14
Public Education Agencies	.38	.13
Proprietary Schools	.27	.06
Economic Development Agencies	.38	.11
Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies	.38	.16
Employers	.64	.10
MEAN SCORE	.37	.14

* Entries represent the mean coordination score for each agency across each of the five planning mechanisms and ten operational mechanisms respectively. Complete data for each of these measures can be found in the full report on coordination.

(a) written agreements to refer clients to and from SDAs; (b) formal agreements to provide feedback on clients referred to other agencies; (c) collocation of offices in the same building; (d) joint appointments to PICs and boards of other agencies; (e) formal agreements in which job developers from two agencies agree to contact different employers, or specialize in different types of jobs at the same firms; (f) formal agreements to share information about job development and OJT experience with specific firms; (g) reducing duplication of services between the SDA and another agency by eliminating funding for one of the programs, and referring clients with need for the service to the remaining service provider; (h) joint funding of programs by two or more agencies; (i) institution of formal procedures to create joint case teams for clients of the SDA and other agencies; and (j) SDA subcontracts or non-financial agreements with agencies that already provide a service, rather than developing an independent capacity to deliver the service.

Exhibits 3-2 and 3-3 and the backup tables in the full report on coordination show that SDAs frequently enter into subcontracts and/or non-financial agreements with other agencies. However, with rare exceptions, very few of the other operational mechanisms are in place with any of the nine agencies. The most frequently encountered mechanisms are formal client referral agreements, joint appointments to PICs and agency boards, and formal agreements to provide feedback on referrals, all of which are present, on average, in a about a quarter of the SDA relationships with other public and private agencies.

The exhibits also show that these results are far more likely to be found with the public Employment Service than with any other agency. At the other extreme, SDAs were least likely to report the presence of one of these operational coordination mechanisms with proprietary schools.

Coordination with Title III Programming

In order to promote comparisons with the CETA program, this study has focused on the year-round and summer activities funded under Title II of the Job Training Partnership Act. However, any analysis of coordination of employment and training programs must address relationships between the Title II programs that are run by SDA administrative entities and the Title III dislocated worker programs that are administered at the state level and are, at times, subcontracted to SDAs or other organizations. Analysis of information provided by SDAs suggests that there is generally close coordination between Title II and Title III activities when both are administered by SDAs. In these instances, there are usually a common intake unit, a common assessment unit, common criteria for assigning clients to specific program components, and a common placement unit for the two Title III programs.

Exhibit 3-3

SDA UTILIZATION OF SUBCONTRACTS

AND NON-FINANCIAL AGREEMENTS IN PY 1985

(Entries represent proportion of SDAs reporting one or more subcontracts or non-financial agreements of each type or with each agency)

	Subcontracts	Nonfinancial Agreements
Type of Agency		
WIN	7%*	29%
ES	50	57
Welfare	10	48
Vocational Education	62	31
Public Educ. Agencies	81	33
Proprietary Schools	81	12
Economic Dev't Agencies	24	21
Vocational Rehabilitation	50	43
Private Employers	79	14
ONE OR MORE OF THE ABOVE	98%	81%
Function		
Recruitment	40%*	64%
Intake	36	26
Class. voc. skills training	93	19
Other classroom training	62	31
OJT	62	19
Work Experience	24	12
Job Search Assistance	52	29
Job Development	52	26
Supportive Services	24	38

* N=42 in all cases.

These figures drop off dramatically when agencies other than SDAs are responsible for Title III within a given jurisdiction. For example, only about a quarter of the twenty-one SDAs with Title III programs that they do not administer indicate that there is a common intake unit, and none of them have a common assessment unit. About a fifth have a common information system and about a tenth report that there is a common placement unit.

Moreover, despite many efforts to coordinate with non-SDA Title III agencies, the subjective ratings given to coordination between the two agencies by SDA officials were lower than those given eight of the nine agencies addressed earlier in this chapter. The only agency that SDAs felt that they had worse relationships with was the WIN program.

Coordination with Other SDAs

The typical SDA is regularly engaged in activities to coordinate with nearby SDAs and the perceived levels of coordination with other SDAs are among the highest encountered in this study. As expected, efforts to coordinate with other SDAs are higher among SDAs that do not cover an entire labor market.

Summary

Exhibit 3-4 on the following page presents the rank ordering of the subjective ("perceptions") and objective measures of SDA coordination presented in this chapter. Two major conclusions seem to stand out:

- First, coordination is a multi-dimensional concept, and it is therefore dangerous to generalize about the levels of SDA coordination with other agencies. Rank orderings vary considerably depending upon the specific measures that are employed. All agencies except WIN/WIN Demo can be found in the top third for at least one of the groups of measures.

- Second, measured coordination with ES tends to be at the top of the list and measured coordination with proprietary schools, welfare, and WIN/WIN Demo tends to be at the bottom of the list.

4.3 Changes in Coordination

The most striking study results involve the absence of change that has followed the transition from CETA to JTPA. In two-thirds or more of the Prime Sponsors/SDAs, a simple rule can be used for predicting whether or not a given form of coordination is present under JTPA:

- If it was present under CETA, it will still be present and

- If it was not present under CETA, it will not be present.

Exhibit 3-4

RANK ORDERING OF SDA COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES*

Agreements	Perceived Levels	Presence of: Five Mechanisms for Planning	Ten Operational Mechanisms	Sub-contracts	Non-Financial Agree-ments	TOTAL**
ES	2	2	1	5 (T)	1	1
Public Education Agencies	3 (T)***	3 (T)	4 (T)	1 (T)	4	2
Vocational Rehabili-tation	5 (T)	3 (T)	2	5 (T)	3	3
Private Employers	1	1	8	3	8	4
Vocational Education	5 (T)	6	3	4	5	5
Economic Development Agencies	3 (T)	3 (T)	7	7	7	6
Welfare	7	7	4 (T)	8	2	7
Proprietary Schools	8	8	9	1 (T)	9	8
WIN/WIN Demo	9	9	4 (T)	9	6	9

* Based on the information in Exhibits 2-1, 2-2, and 2-3 in the full coordination report.

** Mean score based on all five entries in each row.

*** (T) denotes tied for that ranking.

Where change do occur, increases in coordination have tended to outnumber decreases. The positive developments documented by the study include an increase in the input that other agencies have into Prime Sponsor/SDA planning, and greater utilization of formal referral agreements, joint funding of programs, and contracting for the provision of classroom vocational skills training. Notable increases in coordination can be found with the vocational rehabilitation and WIN programs.

On the other hand, there is little evidence of improved coordination with the Employment Service. In fact, there are numerous examples of backsliding, instances in which coordination has declined following the implementation of JTPA.

Changes in Perceived Levels of Coordination

Comparisons of subjective ratings of coordination in the last year of CETA and the second full program year in JTPA show little overall change. As is illustrated by Exhibit 3-5 on the following page, in nearly half the cases, Prime Sponsors/SDAs gave precisely the same assessment under both programs; assessments went up in about a quarter of the SDAs and went down in the remaining quarter. Although the differences are not great, SDAs were more likely to report an increase in perceived levels of coordination than a decrease with respect to the WIN and vocational rehabilitation programs. At the other extreme, SDAs were more likely to report decreases in coordination with ES, vocational education, other public education agencies, and proprietary schools.

Changes in Planning Mechanisms Designed to Promote Coordination

For the most part, the utilization of planning mechanisms to promote coordination is no different today than it was prior to the implementation of JTPA. When a Prime Sponsor utilized a mechanism, the SDA covering the same territory has tended to continue to use it, and when a Prime Sponsor has not utilized it, it is unlikely that the SDA has adopted it. The proportion of SDAs reporting no change for each mechanism is summarized below:

- Agencies having input into SDA planning -- 70%*
- Agencies having quarterly meetings with SDA -- 60%
- Agencies having monthly meetings with SDA -- 75%
- Agencies sharing an umbrella agency with SDA -- 97%
- Agencies having contiguous service areas with SDAs -- 79%

AVERAGE OF ALL OF THE ABOVE -- 76%

*Each number represents the mean of the proportions of Prime Sponsors/SDAs with no change, averaged across either all nine types of groups, or the seven public agencies, whichever is appropriate.

Exhibit 3-5

CHANGES IN PERCEIVED LEVELS OF COORDINATION

(ALL SDAs)*

	JTPA is Lower	Same	JTPA is Higher	(N)
WIN	.30**	.26	.43	(23)
ES	.35	.45	.19	(31)
Welfare	.20	.60	.20	(30)
Voc. Ed.	.36	.50	.14	(28)
Public Ed.	.36	.57	.07	(28)
Proprietary Schools	.33	.46	.21	(24)
Economic Dev't	.31	.45	.24	(29)
Voc. Rehab.	.18	.54	.29	(28)
Employers	.14	.59	.28	(29)
MEAN SCORE***	.28	.49	.23	--

* Exhibit is based on all Prime Sponsors/SDAs providing subjective ratings for both time periods, with the number of SDAs in parentheses in the extreme right hand column. Exhibit D-1 (b) in Appendix D to the full coordination report contains a parallel analysis that is limited to SDAs with identical boundaries to the prime sponsorships from whom information was obtained for the previous study.

** Entries represent proportion of SDAs falling into each category for each type of agency. Based on a scale in which 1=non-existent, 2=minimal, 3=good, and 4=excellent for each time period.

*** Average of all scores in the column.

Changes in Operational Mechanisms to Coordinate Service Delivery

SDA utilization of operational mechanisms to promote coordination was essentially unchanged for all but three of the types of measures for which CETA and JTPA data were both available. However, there were modest increases in referral agreements, joint funding, and contracting for classroom skills training. The proportion of SDAs providing information that indicates no change for each of the operational mechanisms is summarized below:

- Written referral agreements -- 75%*
- Collocation -- 83%
- Specialization in different employers -- 90%
- SDA eliminating an activity and referring clients to another agency -- 91%
- Agency eliminating an activity and referring clients to the SDA -- 95%
- Joint funding of programs -- 74%
- Joint case teams -- 87%
- Contracting for referral services -- 81%
- Contracting for intake services -- 90%
- Contracting for classroom skills training -- 80%
- Contracting for other classroom training -- 82%
- Contracting for OJT -- 87%
- Contracting for work experience -- 90%
- Contracting for job search assistance -- 84%
- Contracting for job development -- 79%
- Contracting for support services -- 87%

AVERAGE OF ALL OF THE ABOVE -- 85%

Changes in Coordination with Individual Agencies

The analyses presented thus far have relied upon measures which average the impact of changes in coordination across nine agencies or programs. As is shown in Exhibit 3-6, a number of major differences appear when one conducts separate analyses of coordination with each agency:

- By far the greatest increase in objective measures of coordination can be found with the vocational rehabilitation program,
- The next greatest increases were discovered with the WIN and WIN Demo programs, and
- There has been a net decrease in many measures of coordination between SDAs and the Employment Service.

---

* Each number represents the mean of the proportions of SDAs with no change, averaged across either all nine types of organizations, or the seven public agencies, whichever is appropriate.

Exhibit 3-6

AGENCY BY AGENCY ANALYSIS OF CHANGES IN COORDINATION

BASED ON TWENTY-ONE OBJECTIVE MEASURES*

Agency/Program	Amount of Coordination: Less**	Same	More	n.a.	Net Change
WIN/WIN Demo	1	15	5		+4
ES	7	10	4		-3
Welfare Agencies	2	14	5		+5
Vocational Education	2	14	5		+3
Other Public Education Agencies	3	14	4		+1
Proprietary Schools	2	13	3	3	+1
Economic Development Agencies	1	17	3		+2
Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies	1	9	11		+10
Private Employers	2	12	4	3	+2

---

* Analysis based on data from all Prime Sponsors and SDAs that provided data.

** "Less coordination" on a measure is defined as a net loss of three or more SDAs reporting the presence of that measure; "more coordination" means a net gain or three or more SDAs; all other instances have been coded as being the "same" level of coordination. The data used for this exhibit has been taken from Exhibits D - 3 (a) through D - 23 (a) in Appendix D of the full coordination report.

Vocational Rehabilitation

Increased coordination with vocational rehabilitation (VR) programs was not one of the major thrusts of the JTPA legislation and has not received much public attention among JTPA administrators at the State or SDA levels. However, there was a net increase in coordination with VR for 10 of the 21 objective measures of coordination used in this study. Although three is no information available about the numbers of clients that are affected by these linkages, or the reasons why they have occurred, there can be little doubt there has been a major cementing of ties between SDAs and VR agencies in recent years.

WIN

Coordination with the WIN and WIN Demo programs was rated the lowest of the nine agencies and programs on both subjective and objective measures of coordination under both CETA and JTPA. But analysis of the twenty-one objective measures for which data are available for both programs indicates that there have been more increases in coordination for WIN and WIN Demo for any other agency or program except vocational rehabilitation.

The results of the study also suggest a similar, although weaker, trend towards improved coordination with welfare agency operations other than the portions of the agency responsible for services under WIN or the overall operation of WIN Demo.

The Employment Service

As noted in Appendix A to this report, the JTPA legislation incorporates a number of provisions designed to promote closer interaction between SDAs and the public Employment Service. The results of this study suggest that progress in this area has been limited at best. Net declines of three or more SDAs (out of approximately 33 providing data) were encountered for seven of the twenty-one measures, considerably more than was encountered for any other agency or program.

Available data on referrals between ES and JTPA provide further cause for concern. The the majority of SDAs providing data on this topic report declines in the proportion of program participants who were referred to them by ES, while only about a quarter report increases.

Coordination with Vocational Education and Other Public Education Agencies

Exhibit 3-6 suggests that, if anything, there has been a mild trend towards increased coordination with agencies running vocational education programs and other public education agencies. More than two-thirds of the SDAs providing before and after data on this topic report an increase in the proportion of vocational skills training participants who are trained in facilities owned or operated by public education agencies.

Coordination with Proprietary Schools

Exhibit 3-6 shows that there has been little change in coordination with proprietary schools following the passage of JTPA. Moreover, unlike the case of public education agencies, there has been no change in the utilization of proprietary school facilities for classroom size vocational skills training since the implementation of JTPA.

Coordination with Economic Development Agencies and Private Sector Employers

JTPA was designed so that partnership with the private sector would be its middle name. However, despite all of the mechanisms to promote involvement of private employers and the increased emphasis on linking job training to economic development activities, the exhibit shows little change in objective measures of coordination with either the public sector agency or the private sector employers.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

The findings presented in this chapter and the preceding one have all been based on information about employment and training activities and coordination provided by fifty Prime Sponsors/ Service Delivery Areas prior to and subsequent to the implementation of JTPA. The following two chapters address many of these same issues using a very different data base, the JTPA implementation research literature.

Chapter Four

FINDINGS OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW RELATIVE TO JTPA ACTIVITIES

4.1 Introduction and Overview

Although the authors of the major research studies have sometimes taken differing perspectives on the JTPA system and have emphasized different aspects and issues, there is a broad consensus about the general direction in which the system is moving: more emphasis on activities that are directly related to the acquisition of marketable skills, and less on "developmental employment activities" that generally take longer and cost more. As is discussed in this chapter and in a more thoroughly documented companion paper, care must be taken in interpreting these or other research findings about JTPA for at least two reasons:

- There is immense diversity in the JTPA system. As a result, summary statistics based on samples of SDAs cannot always be depended upon to provide reliable indicators of what one would encounter if one visited a randomly chosen SDA.
- Much, but not all, of the commonly accepted "conventional wisdom" about the JTPA system is based upon early studies of the nine month transition quarter, and may need modification in the light of the more recent experience.

4.2 The JTPA Service Mix: Continuity, Change, and Diversity

The JTPA implementation literature presents a consensus that the SDAs are, in general, implementing a "no frills training program that can place a very high percentage of its participants in jobs quickly and comparatively inexpensively". (Solow 86) The literature is also in broad agreement on the following aspects of the nature of the service mix:

- Classroom training remains the central activity in the program;
- Job search assistance is an important and growing component;
- OJT is an increasingly prominent component; and
- Work experience is declining in importance.

4.2.1 Classroom Training

The centrality of classroom training to JTPA is beyond dispute. This mode of training is offered by virtually all SDAs and is generally said to be offered to roughly two-fifths of the participants. As one of the Westat studies put it:

> Notwithstanding the growing popularity of OJT and job search, classroom skill training is still the backbone of service delivery. Occupational skills training in the classroom setting is the principal training format for one-half of the SDAs in the sample. (Cook 85A)

Within the overall framework of classroom training, there is growing emphasis on vocational skills training, and less on prevocational training. Although a majority of SDAs still seem to be offering prevocational programs, they tend to offer it to only small proportions of their clients.

Most of the JTPA implementation literature points to the growing popularity of classroom training, but there are at least two substantial exceptions to this rule. The final Westat study argues that there is less reliance on this mode than there was under CETA, and one of the Grinker-Walker studies argues that there has been little change in emphasis:

> On average, the study sites reported that the level of classroom training as a share of total employment and training activities was about the same as it had been under CETA. (Walker 85).

These differences of opinion are probably due at least in part the kinds of methodological issues addressed earlier in this paper including, in particular, definitional issues of what is included in the term classroom training, and the proper CETA base year and data to use as a comparison. However, the safest conclusion seems to be that the issue is by no means resolved and is worthy of further attention.

4.2.2 Job Search Assistance

There is widespread agreement that SDAs are making greater use of job search assistance than did their CETA Prime Sponsor predecessors. However, this increase is not an across the board phenomenon; some SDAs are making much greater use of this approach than are others.

4.2.3 OJT

The JTPA implementation literature contains many references to increased utilization of OJT and generally concludes that about one-fifth of JTPA participants now receive training while on the job. This conventional wisdom can be illustrated by the following excerpts from the literature:

> OJT has been more heavily utilized under JTPA than it was under CETA....JTLS data show an estimate of 22 percent [of the clients receive OJT], and [Westat] Field Associates found an average of 21 percent for the twenty-four SDAs in our study where disaggregated data were available. This compares with 9 percent in CETA's first fiscal year and 11 percent in FY 77 through FY 79. (Cook 85)

> [OJT] received a major increase in its share of overall funding in 72 percent of the sites and some increase in 16 percent--no sample site reported a decrease in on-the-job training activities. (Walker 85)

However, the Westat studies argue that precise comparisons between CETA and JTPA are difficult to make, and can be greatly affected by the assumptions one makes. Using a different basis for comparisons can result in a conclusion that the emphasis given OJT is comparable to that under CETA:

> If we exclude both public service employment and youth work experience participants from the CETA figures, on-the-job training accounted for 15 percent of CETA participants in FY 79 and 19 percent in FY 80. These figures are still lower than the on-the-job training percentages for JTPA, but only slightly lower. (Cook 85)

At minimum, this minority opinion should be taken as a cautionary note, and a reminder that JTPA-CETA comparisons are often based on somewhat arbitrary assumptions.

4.2.4 Work Experience

Unlike the situations with respect to the classroom training and OJT components, the JTPA implementation literature is unanimous in concluding that the legislative restrictions on funding for work experience have had their intended effect, and there is therefore now less work experience than was the case under CETA. Also unlike other components, there is relatively little variation in utilization of work experience.

Although substantial numbers of SDAs still offer work experience (a Grinker Walker study estimated it to be "slightly more than half"), it is being offered to relatively few participants. Both the Department of Labor information systems and the major studies suggest that work experience is now offered to no more than one in eight JTPA participants. Representative quotations from the literature include:

> Work experience programs are not being planned for operation at a significant level at any SDA [in the study sample]. Nine [of the 25] sites did not indicate any plans to operate work experience [in TY 84]. At the 16 field sites that intended to operate work experience programs, most were to be small, enrolling less than 10% of JTPA participants. (Walker 84)

> Most SDAs responded [to the JTPA restrictions on work experience] by simply not developing work experience slots; in the few SDAs that did provide work experience, the focus was usually on youths, and work experience was shorter than it had been under CETA. (Cook 84)

> GAO also noted that the number of participants enrolled in work experience decreased by 66 percent at the 10 locations that offered this training under CETA in fiscal year 1982. (GAO 85A)

4.2.5 Support Services

The JTPA implementation literature documents widespread utilization of support services by SDAs, but at levels that are sharply diminished from those that existed under CETA. For example, the final Westat report notes that 39 of the 40 SDAs in its sample provided supportive services and/or needs-based payments, and the fortieth made them available through referrals to other agencies. However, most studies document that the vast majority of SDAs are spending considerably less than the 15 percent limit for this purpose. Representative excerpts from the literature include the following:

> Unlike CETA, in which most prime sponsors paid hourly stipends and cash payments, only about half of all SDAs provide either stipends or cash payments, and these are usually restricted to participants meeting certain criteria. (NAB 84)

> Overall, the responding SDAs spent an average of 7 percent of their funds on support assistance...75 SDAs [in a sample of 461] spent at least 15 percent of their funds on participants support and 35 SDAs spent none. Of the 35 however, 14 were providing some support assistance through funded agreements with state, local, or community based agencies. (GAO 85A)

On the other hand, a hypothesis that SDAs may now be increasing the amount of resources devoted to supportive services is found in the only report devoted primarily to this topic:

> Overall 441 SDAs [out of 461 respondents, or 96 percent] were planning to increase their expenditures [for support services] to an average of 8 percent [during the first program year]. For example 113 SDAs were planning to spent 15 percent or more on participant support [as compared with 75 SDAs during the transition year]. (GAO 85A)

4.3 Analyses of Specific Activities

Terms like "classroom training", "OJT", and "supportive services" are useful in providing an overview of the types of activities that are traditionally carried out in employment and training programs. However, there are wide variations in the types of activities that can be carried out under these broad categories. The JTPA implementation literature contains many findings and conclusions relative to the "fine detail" of the activities funded under the Act and the ways that they have been changing over time.

4.3.1 Classroom Training

The JTPA research literature is in general agreement on two broad trends in the nature of classroom training offered by SDAs:

- The specific types of classroom training offered under JTPA reflect, to a large degree, the types of training offered under CETA. However, they tend to be more vocationally oriented and employer-specific than under CETA.

- The length of classroom training courses declined during the nine month transition year, but seems to be increasing since that time.

Continuity and Emphasis on Employer-Specific Training

The continuity in training occupations and emphasis on employer specific training can be illustrated by the final Westat study and one of the NAB surveys respectively:

> The [JTPA] classroom skill training provided is primarily for clerical, operative, and maintenance occupations, as was the case for most classroom training under MDTA and CETA. (Cook 85A)

> Non-occupational classroom training was made available to considerably fewer participants than were enrolled in other types of training (less than twenty percent of all adults). (NAB 84)

Length of Training

Although the picture is somewhat muddied by different definitions of training, most of the research studies suggest that the length of time that JTPA clients spend in classroom training is either slightly shorter or considerably shorter than their CETA predecessors. Representative excerpts from the literature that support the conventional wisdom of shorter training courses include:

> Average training time appears to be less than it was under CETA. JTPA is a program for those who are job ready or nearly job ready. (Cook 85A)

> Occupational classroom training under JTPA averages 22 weeks at these [eleven sample] SDAs, while during CETA FY 82 at the same SDAs, this training averaged 23 weeks. (GAO 85A)

> The average length of training under Title IIA programs was 12.5 weeks and 12.8 weeks for adults and youth respectively, considerably less than the average length of training under CETA. (NAB 85)

However, there is evidence from a number of sources that the length of classroom training in general, and vocational skills training, in particular, has been growing as JTPA matures. JTLS data note an increase in classroom training from 12.9 weeks in the transition year to 17.7 weeks in the first program year, and a NAB survey concurs that:

> Many SDAs are expecting that many more of their enrollees will be involved in long-term training programs than was the case during the transition period. (NAB 85)

Despite this apparent trend towards longer training as JTPA matures, it still seems reasonable to conclude that training in PY 84 was still shorter in duration than was usually the case under CETA. It will be important to obtain parallel data from PY 85 and later to determine if there is a continued narrowing of the gap.

4.3.2 Job Search Assistance

The research literature documents the fact that job search assistance programs vary considerably from SDA to SDA. For example, job search assistance programs are sometimes aspects of vocational training or counseling programs, and are sometimes independently funded activities.

According to the final Westat study, job search assistance at the 40 sample SDAs varied in duration from as short as 3 or 4 days up to several weeks, with a modal time of two weeks. However, despite this diversity, the overall implications of the move toward increased utilization of job search assistance seem clear: shorter training. As the final Westat study put it:

> Whenever job search training occurs, it is a relatively short-term activity ...that shifts the overall distribution of training time for participants downward. (Cook 85A)

4.3.3 On-the Job Training

The JTPA implementation literature is in general agreement that JTPA OJT slots are, on average, shorter-term and lower wage than their CETA predecessors. Recent research suggests that the trend towards shorter training may have reversed, leaving OJT slots roughly as long as their CETA predecessors.

Length of Training

The prevailing conventional wisdom about shorter OJT slots is summarized in one of the Westat studies as follows:

> The median length of stay in on-the-job training under JTPA is shorter than it was under CETA, by as much as two to three weeks. [After adjusting JTLS to make it comparable,] the resulting data show that for CETA participants who entered on-the-job training during FY 80, the median length of stay was fourteen weeks for youth and fifteen for adults. For JTPA, the comparable figures for TY 84 was 12.1 weeks, with no significant difference between adults and youth. (Cook 85)

A GAO study of eleven SDAs came to a similar conclusion, namely that OJT training was two weeks shorter than under CETA.

However, despite the widespread support for the thesis that JTPA OJT is shorter than its CETA predecessor, there are some indications that this difference had been greatly diminished--if not wiped out--as JTPA entered its first full program year. In particular, the JTLS data published by the Department of Labor in November, 1985, indicate a considerable increase in the median length of stay of OJT clients between the transition year that the Westat and GAO data are based on and PY 84, rising from 11.7 weeks to 14.8 weeks. If this difference would hold under the adjustments made by Westat, it would just about eliminate the observed difference, and lead to a conclusion that there has been no major change in length of OJT contracts since CETA's demise.

Low Wage OJT Slots

There is no evidence to contradict the other part of the OJT conventional wisdom, i.e., that JTPA OJT contract and placement wages tend to be in relatively low wage jobs. One of the Westat studies analyzed a sample of 609 OJT contracts and came up with a median hourly contract wage of $ 4.50, with more than 16 percent of the contracts being at the minimum wage or below it.

4.3.4 Work Experience

Unsurprisingly, the literature documents the fact that under JTPA, work experience has been targeted to youth more often than for adults. This conclusion is supported by data from studies conducted by Westat and the GAO.

4.3.5 Programs Targeted on Youth

The following generalizations can be made about JTPA programming for youth:

- SDAs often serve youth in programs designed for the general population, although most SDAs have at least some services targeted specially at youth;

- Many SDAs are having difficulty in spending the required percentage of funds on youth;

  --SDAs that have developed special programming for youth are more likely to reach their youth expenditure targets than those that attempt to serve youth in general purpose programs; and

- The majority of SDAs have now adopted one or more sets of competencies to serve as positive outcomes for youth-oriented programming.

Differing Perspectives on the Provision of Youth-Specific Programming

The JTPA implementation literature provides a variety of perspectives on programming for youth. A study by the GAO concludes that youth are generally not served in programs designed to meet their specific needs:

> The SDAs that we visited generally had entered into few contracts for serving only youth. More often, youth were included in contracts serving the general eligible population. In total, contracts for serving only youth amounted to about $ 7.7 million, or about 19 percent of the total awards. (GAO 85)

On the other hand, the Westat studies suggest that youth-oriented programs are presented in about two-thirds of the SDAs:

> Of those [nineteen SDAs] reporting on this topic, six noted that no special service mix existed for youths. In these SDAs, adults and youths participate in essentially the same types of training programs, or special youth programs are very small. In the remaining thirteen SDAs, however, the associates identified one or more special training programs designed especially to serve a majority of that SDA's youth population. (Cook 85)

There is also conflicting evidence on such topics as the degree to which SDAs are targeting their efforts on dropouts and the extent to which they have adopted "exemplary programming" for youth. More work must be done to explain these differences.

Meeting the Youth Expenditure Standard

The JTPA research literature contains many indications that SDAs have been having trouble meeting the 40 percent youth expenditure standard. However, recent NAB and Westat studies suggest that this problem is becoming less severe as JTPA matures. Both the Westat and Grinker-Walker field studies agree that the key to meeting the standard appears to be developing programs that are targeted on youth. As one of them put it:

In general, where SDAs were able to establish special youth programs, such as customized classroom training, or more importantly, exemplary youth programs, work experience, or tryout employment, they achieved their youth expenditure requirements. (Cook 85)

Youth Competencies

The JTPA implementation literature documents clear progress in the development and implementation of competencies for positive terminations in youth programs. However, there seems to be a wide variety of types of competencies that are being adopted. Thus, for example, a survey conducted by the National Governor's Association indicated that 347 SDAs (60% of the 579 SDAs in the states from which data were available) had already adopted youth competency systems and an additional 114 programs would have such systems in operation by the end of the program year on July 1, yielding a total of 77 percent of the SDAs. (NGA, November 1985). According to another study:

> Pre-employment/work maturity competency is the most developed area. Basic education and the job specific competencies are the least developed. (NAB/NGA 1985)

4.3.6 Outreach, Intake and Assessment

The limited available information about outreach is conflicting. For example, one Westat study indicated that only about a quarter of its sample SDAs conducted outreach, but the latest Westat study indicates that outreached has "increased substantially" between the transition and first program years.

Similarly, most of the JTPA implementation literature indicates that SDAs have tended to centralize intake and conduct it in-house. However, recent reports from the Grinker-Walker and Westat teams suggest that as of PY 1984, the trend is going the other way, allowing service providers to handle their own intake. As one of them puts it:

> The recruitment and assignment of participants into specific training activities has been less centralized under JTPA than it was under CETA. Training providers themselves are increasingly likely to be responsible for their own outreach and screening of participants. This change is primarily a result of reduced central administrative budgets under JTPA. (Solow 86).

There is very little discussion of assessment and testing techniques in use by SDAs. However, what little there is tends to stress the variety of techniques and procedures that different SDAs have adopted.

4.3.7 Support Services

Studies conducted by NAB and Westat suggest two trends in the provision of support services: considerable continuity in the type of supportive services offered under JTPA, but efforts to limit their scope from the levels experienced under CETA. For example, they agree that transportation and day care are, by far, the most commonly offered services. Representative excerpts from these studies include:

> The supportive services most commonly provided under CETA continued to be provided under JTPA, but are usually restricted to those most in need or in certain types of training programs. (NAB 84)

> In general, [stipend and allowance] payments are lower and more restricted than they were under CETA. (Cook 84)

A GAO report on this topic documents the fact that SDAs have employed a variety of administrative mechanisms to distribute supportive services, have adopted many different eligibility criteria, and appear to be making increasing use of non-JTPA funds for this purpose.

Interpretation of the published data on supportive services is, however, complicated by that fact that using different measures or different samples of SDAs often results in very different kinds of results. For example, a NAB survey shows that more than four-fifths of the SDAs provide child care services, whereas the Grinker-Walker studies tend to stress the low proportion of JTPA funding allocated for this purpose.

4.3.8 Set-Aside Programs

The major JTPA implementation studies do not shed much light on the nature of JTPA programs funded under the Title IIA vocational education (8 percent) and older worker (3 percent) set-asides. However, several special purpose reports that focus exclusively on these programs provide some useful information.

The Vocational Education Set-Aside

An NGA study reveals that the service mix for the 8 percent set-aside programs is very different from the "block grant" 78 percent money in Title IIA. In particular, more than 90 percent of the vocational education set-aside participants receive classroom training as opposed to only about 35% of the Title IIA 78 percent money terminees.

The Older Worker Set-Aside

A 1985 study conducted by the University of Southern California documents the variety of ways that states have chosen to distribute the older worker set-aside funds, the size of the programs, the length of training, and types of training offered.

An NGA study indicates that these "3% monies" are much more heavily oriented to job search assistance than the 78% money:

> In contrast to the Title II-A program in which about one-fourth of the adult terminees received job search assistance, over one-half of the three percent program terminees participated in this component. (Alegria and Figueroa 1986)

4.4 The JTPA Service Delivery System

The JTPA implementation literature addresses many aspects of the administrative arrangements that SDAs have entered into in order to deliver the above-described employment and training services, including the degree to which SDAs choose to subcontract, the utilization of different types of service deliverers, and the utilization of performance based contracts.

4.4.1 Prevalence of Subcontracting

Several JTPA implementation studies indicate or imply that SDAs subcontract the majority of their title IIA funds. For example the TY 84 site visits undertaken by the GAO revealed that about 68% of the training-related and participant support dollars were subcontracted to a variety of types of service deliverers at the sample SDAs. According to this study, roughly a third of the subcontracts were for classroom training, and about a fifth were for OJT.

Subcontracting by JTPA Function

As noted above, the literature contains conflicting testimony on the extent to which SDAs subcontract intake. However, there is a broad consensus that SDAs subcontract a large proportion of their training money. For example, a 1985 NAB survey revealed that 83 percent of SDAs subcontracted at least some training money, and that 64 percent subcontracted at least fifty percent of the funds. An earlier NAB survey revealed that 95 percent of the SDAs use more than one type of entity to deliver training, and roughly half use at least four types of service deliverers.

According to most studies, SDAs have generally chosen to develop OJT slots for themselves rather than contract out this function. For example, one of the Westat studies shows that about two-thirds of the SDAs in their sample used in-house job developers for this function.

There is also widespread evidence that SDAs tend to subcontract much of the responsibility for job search and placement. A NAB survey indicates that the most frequently employed placement organizations are training contractors (in more than half the SDAs), the SDA administrative entity (about two-fifths of the SDAs) and the Employment Service (just under a third of the SDAs).

As noted earlier in this paper, the nature of SDA arrangements for delivery of supportive services varies so greatly from site to site that it is difficult to discern any patterns in the literature.

Utilization of Different Types of Subcontractors

Analyses of the distribution of different types of service deliverers are complicated by differences in definitions used in the various studies. Should, for example, all public education agencies be considered as one type of deliverer? Do all private non-profit organizations fit into the same category or should some of them be singled out as "community-based organizations (CBOs)"? Answers to the question "which type of deliverer is used most frequently to provide a given service" thus depend critically upon definitional issues such as these.

These factors, when coupled with the diversity of SDA approaches, may be the cause of the major differences in emphasis in the JTPA research literature on this topic. For example, some studies stress the continuity in types of service deliverers from CETA to JTPA, while others stress change, principally cutbacks in funding for CBOs and increases in funding for public education agencies and for-profit training organizations.

The great majority of SDAs use ES for at least some functions, although in many cases, they do so through non-financial agreements. Both the Westat and ICESA surveys indicate that roughly half the SDAs pay ES to provide at least one function, and the ICESA survey indicates that a similar proportion of SDAs use non-financial agreements to obtain ES services. The implementation studies differ somewhat in their analyses the types of functions that SDAs most frequently turn to the ES for.

The literature also presents a series of apparently contradictory perspectives on the utilization of CBOs. Much of the literature stresses the prominence, if not dominance of CBOs. For example, a GAO study indicated that community-based organizations are awarded JTPA subcontracts more frequently than any other type of contractor, accumulating more than a third of the total contract value, and ranging from 6 percent to 77 percent of the funds at the sample SDAs. Similarly, one of the NAB surveys indicate that more than four-fifths of the SDAs have contracted with at least one CBO for training or services in PY 84, and that overall use of CBOs to provide training and/or services increased between TY 84 and PY 84.

On the other hand, there is a widespread belief that the role of CBOs has been declining, and there is a considerable amount of data to support this belief. For example, one of the NAB surveys indicated that a quarter of the SDAs planned to use fewer CBOs in PY 84 than TY 84, or to use no CBOS at all.

The Grinker-Walker team concurs in the finding that about a quarter (24 percent) of the SDAs made no use of CBOs and another 38 percent used CBOs at a "modest level" (i.e., 10 percent of SDA funding or less). Several studies indicate that public education institutions and for-profit training organizations are picking up the slack being left by cutbacks in utilization of CBOs.

A survey of more than 300 CBOs conducted by Bailis (1984) may explain some of the discrepancies in perspective. The survey showed that some CBOs (especially the "old line" CBOs that were in existence before the War on Poverty) have been doing relatively well, while the other, newer CBOs, have been bearing the brunt of the cutbacks. The survey also indicated that CBOs have been utilized most frequently to provide counseling and other supportive services, next most frequently for job development, job placement, and/or job search assistance, and third most frequently for outreach and assessment.

Much of the JTPA implementation literature stresses the critical role of community colleges, vocational education, and other local public education agencies in the provision of training. One of the NAB surveys revealed that these agencies are used by 85 percent of SDAs, and a Grinker-Walker study concludes that they are the most commonly used service providers.

The Grinker-Walker, GAO, and NAB studies all document a sizable and growing role for private for-profit organizations in the delivery of JTPA training services. The Grinker-Walker team indicates that private for-profit groups are major service providers at about two thirds of their sample SDAs, the GAO found that twelve out of fifteen sample SDAs had entered into contracts with local businesses, and one of the NAB surveys indicated that private employers are the second most frequently utilized type of training agent.

Interpretation of many of these results is clouded, however, by the fact that for-profit firms are inevitably involved in OJT activities, and many of the studies do not adequately disentangle this OJT role from other training roles that for-profit firms can play.

4.4.2 Performance-Based Contracting

Without exception, the JTPA implementation literature describes a substantial and growing utilization of performance-based contracts. Thus, for example, the final Westat study calls this approach a "key and widely used feature of JTPA". According to data from the GAO, 64 percent of the SDAs used this approach in the transition year and roughly 80% intended to do so in the first full program year; the final Westat study indicated that the actual utilization rate was about 85% by the end of the first program year.

Both the NAB and Westat reports indicate that many SDAs are making heavy use of performance-based contracting. One NAB survey showed that about a third of the SDAs writing such contracts are using them for at least three-quarters of their training programs, and roughly 10 percent of the SDAs are using this approach for all of their training. A Westat report summarized the variation in SDA utilization of performance based contracting across different activities in the following way:

> The use of performance-based contracting is widespread in classroom training, somewhat less frequently used in OJT and job search assistance activities. It is infrequently used in OJT and in work experience, summer youth, and various exemplary youth programs, although the trend is to utilize performance based contracts for such activities as well. (Cook 85A)

The Westat studies also note an evolution in the types of performance measures used, moving away from a sole dependence on outcome measures in favor of incorporation of interim and process measures such as enrollment and program completion.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

The JTPA implementation literature pays considerable attention to the ways that the SDAs whose activities are described in this chapter coordinate their efforts with related public programs and with private sector employers. The conclusions that can be drawn from the literature on this topic are summarized in the following chapter.

Chapter Five

FINDINGS OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW RELATIVE TO JTPA COORDINATION

5.1 Introduction and Overview

The JTPA implementation research literature has devoted considerable attention to analyses of the degree to which the desired improvements in coordination have in fact been emerging. Although the Act was intended to promote coordination at both the State and local levels, the "proof of the pudding" is the nature and quality of the services that are available to clients at SDAs. Therefore, wherever possible, this review essay focuses on local level coordination.

While the studies often vary in content and tone, one overall conclusion is emerging: States and SDAs have engaged in many activities to improve coordination since the passage of JTPA, but tangible progress in coordinating programs has been uneven, often relatively modest.

5.2 Overall Patterns of Coordination

The JTPA implementation literature contains numerous references to the fact that states and SDAs have become aware of the value of coordination and have begun to take steps to improve coordination with related programs. As is illustrated in the earliest of the transition studies, state and local officials charged with the initial implementation of JTPA often thought of as being closely linked with other programs:

> Of the 28 [state JTPA liaisons] that did respond [to an MDC survey], 24 (or over 85 percent) voiced the clear expectation that JTPA would indeed become part of a broader state policy initiative--most often related either to educational, vocational training, or economic development efforts. (MDC, 1982)

However, the testimony of two GAO officials in a 1985 Congressional hearing suggests that the rhetoric of improved coordination has not yet been consistently translated into concrete changes in planning and/or service delivery:

JTPA emphasizes the development of an integrated system that coordinates the services of employment, training, education, and other human service agencies. A substantial number of JTPA agencies in the states, though, had not entered any new coordination agreements or arrangements with many such agencies in the early stages of program development. (Testimony of Richard Fogel, in House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, May 2, 1985)

Basically, the coordination issue got off to a slow start...and as states work toward this effort, we anticipate that more accomplishments will be coming. We think that because of the limitations of the types of cash assistance and the amount of money under JTPA will force, of necessity, the various employment and training community members to move toward working with one another. We think that the limitation on funds is going to push for better coordination. (Testimony of Gaston Gianni, in House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, May 2, 1985)

5.2.1 Widespread Efforts to Promote Coordination

A National Governors' Association publication provides perhaps the most comprehensive analysis of the State intentions in the coordination area by carefully analyzing the contents of the Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plans (GCSSPs) that were published in August 1983. The report notes that:

Concerning coordination with the state agencies listed in Section 121 of the Act, 42 of the 44 [multi-SDA] states required all their SDAs to coordinate with them...States have also mandated coordination of SDAs with the following organizations not listed in Section 121 of the Act: 15 list CBOs, 11 list business groups, 9 list labor organizations, 9 list veterans organizations...17 [of 44 multi-SDA] states require written non-financial agreements with all state agencies identified in Section 121... (NGA May 1984)

The Westat studies also note increasing efforts at the state level to promote coordination of JTPA with related programs:

By the end of PY 84, ... promoting of better coordination of State employment and training, education, and economic development activities emerged as a high priority in a number of States as governors, legislators, and SJTCC members became increasingly sensitive to disjointed, often duplicative, State efforts in these areas...

A large number of State Councils have adopted resolutions encouraging (and sometimes requiring) SDAs to utilize State Employment Service and educational institutions, especially vocational schools and community colleges. Several Councils have also identified areas where greater coordination was needed because duplications were pervasive. (Cook 85A)

Similar findings about local level coordination can be found in studies conducted by NAB, the GAO, and Urban Institute. For example, the NAB 84 survey revealed that the majority of SDAs had some steps to promote coordination, such as entering into written agreements with the Employment Service, education agencies and other relevant groups; the GAO (85) found that most SDAs have arrangements through which various agencies could provide input into SDA planning and that most SDA staff met periodically with staff of related agencies to keep each other informed and to coordinate their efforts.

5.2.2 Limited Progress in Achieving the Benefits of Coordination

It is difficult to generalize about the overall assessments of progress in achieving the benefits of coordination that can be found in the JTPA implementation literature: some tend to be positive and others tend to be less so. In many instances, interpretation of the findings requires an answer to the classic question, "Is the glass half full, or half empty?"

An Urban Institute study provides perhaps the most upbeat assessment of improvements in coordination:

> There is more interaction under JTPA with other organizations and agencies in general, especially for linking resources, and with the welfare departments or WIN for recruiting potential trainees...
>
> In all four communities [in which structured interviews took place] the SDAs were actively attempting to develop closer linkages with programs and agencies where other funds and resources could be merged.... In all four sites, closer relations were developing between JTPA and adult and vocational education programs and community colleges. (Nightingale 85)

However, despite these positive findings, much of the literature addresses the limited degree to which commitments to improve coordination have, as yet, been translated into tangible changes in service delivery systems. The Westat studies suggest that SDAs have not always cleared defined exactly what they hope to accomplish in the way of improved coordination:

> In JTPA, as in its predecessors, statements of State policy about partnerships with local government, and between the public and private sectors are often rhetorical phrases rather than clear guidelines for action. Thus, for example, we continue to see under JTPA, a proliferation of non-financial agreements between entities seeking to facilitate something that is poorly defined. (Cook 85)

The Grinker-Walker studies clearly articulate the need to be cautious in assuming that SDAs have already been able to achieve all of the objectives of improved coordination that they and others have set for themselves:

> Except where the benefit to both coordinating agencies was clear, coordination of any significance was not yet evident at most sites. (Walker 84)

> Fulfillment of the state's requirements of SDA coordination with other public agencies interested in employment and training was uneven. (Walker 85)

A General Accounting Office study and a 1984 Senate Oversight Committee report echo this same theme:

> We asked the states to provide examples of significant local coordination accomplishments. The states provided relatively few specific examples, and some states reported not enough time had elapsed for meaningful local coordination to develop in some required areas. (GAO 85)

> State attempts at coordinating JTPA with related programs received mixed reviews [at committee hearings]. Coordination requirements are frequently one-way, said a number of people, with JTPA required to coordinate with other programs, but no similar requirements for other programs to coordinate activities with JTPA. (Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity, December, 1984)

5.3 Coordination with the Employment Service

The amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act contained in Title V of JTPA were designed to reorient the public Employment Service (ES) in new directions, including closer ties with the JTPA SDAs than had existed between ES and the CETA Prime Sponsors. Perhaps as a result of the prominent attention to SDA-ES relationships in the Act, there has been more attention paid to this aspect of JTPA coordination than to others in the literature reviewed for this study. Although the specific studies differ somewhat in tone, it seems clear that there have been many efforts to promote coordination with ES at the state and local level; however, progress in improving ES coordination with SDAs has been slow at best, and uneven.

5.3.1 Promotion of Coordination at the State Level

Several studies document state-level efforts to promote coordination between the JTPA and Employment Service systems:

> Linkage efforts have dominated JTPA-related Employment Service (ES) activities at both the State and local level since program inception. (Cook 85A)

> Analysis of sample GCSSPs [Governor's Coordination Plans] reveals that in a great many instances, state JTPA councils and state ES agencies broke significant new ground in building closer ties between ES and JTPA services. (ICESA 1985)

However, the ICESA report also contains some information that suggests that it may be too soon to conclude that coordination with ES is going as smoothly as was intended by the Congressional authors of the Act:

> In just over half the states, SJTCC involvement in ES planning was limited largely to "after-the-fact" reviews of completed state ES plans of service and/or local ES plans...
>
> Nationally, 40 of the 53 ES agencies surveyed said they had participated to varying degrees in the development of state coordination plans. Among those 40 however, accompanying explanatory comments suggested that at least eight had participated only in cursory, after the fact reviews of the plans which were essentially completed by SJTCC staff.
>
> Given the 13 states in which SESAs played no role whatsoever in GCSSP plan development, plus the eight SESAs whose role was limited to review only, it appears that at least 21 state ES agencies had little or no opportunity to contribute meaningfully to JTPA coordination planning. (ICESA 1985)

5.3.2 ES Coordination with SDAs

The research literature on the topic of ES-SDA coordination contains numerous examples of improved coordination, but with the major exception of a study conducted by the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies (ICESA), the authors of the major studies often come close to concluding that improvements in coordination between ES and the JTPA system has been disappointingly slow.

(a) Overall Assessment: Limited Progress

The most positive assessment of ES-JTPA coordination comes from an August 1984 survey of all 53 State Employment Security Agencies (SESAs):

> We think it is clear that considerable change is occurring and...significant progress is being made in the area of coordination. (ICESA 1985)

But even this report notes that:

> Equally clear is the fact that while results to date have met or even exceeded expectations in some areas, others remain in need of need of further attention, improvement, and refinement. (ICESA 1985)

The following statements are representative assessments of ES-SDA coordination in the major JTPA implementation studies:

> In most of the States in the sample, the Title V amendments have not yet had a major impact upon JTPA-ES coordination. (Macro 84)
>
> Coordination with the Employment Service, though stressed by the Act and the States, was not yet significantly different than it had been under CETA as JTPA commenced. (Walker 84),
>
> Coordination with the Employment Service showed a modest increase over that which existed under CETA, primarily in terms of establishing joint service boundaries or colocating offices. Few sites achieved substantive or programmatic coordination beyond that which had previously existed. (Walker 85)
>
> In a number of States, ES administrators, JTPA staff, and/or the State Council pushed for greater use of ES by SDAs. Sometimes this was successful...Other times it was not. (Cook 85A)

(b) Examples of Progress

It should be be noted, however, that virtually every study that provides an overall assessment of limited progress also includes examples of efforts to coordinate activities and programs. The following excerpts are representative:

> There are instances in most of the sample SDAs of enhanced JTPA coordination under the new legislation. Much of the new activity consists of coordinated efforts in the areas of participant outreach, intake, eligibility determination, and assessment. (Macro 84)
>
> Perhaps a stronger indication of firm ES commitment to the success of the JTPA partnership nationally is that SESAs in 19 states made concessions in their own organizational/ management configurations to accommodate SDA boundaries. Although these changes were admittedly minor in seven states, three SESAs changed all their local office service boundaries, while nine others made significant adjustments. (ICESA 1985)

5.3.3 PIC Input into ES Planning

Studies conducted by Macro Systems Inc and Westat suggest that PIC/SDA involvement in Employment Service planning may be on the increase as JTPA matures. The early JTPA implementation literature indicates that there was very little PIC input into ES planning at the local level. However, more recent studies are beginning to present a somewhat more positive picture. For example the most recent NAB survey of PIC chairs revealed that:

> Over half of the PIC chairs stated that either PIC members themselves (34.6%) or the SDA staff (24.4%) worked closely with the ES to develop the plan before its submission to the full PIC for review and approval. (NAB 85)

5.4 Coordination with Welfare Agencies

The JTPA research literature documents widespread efforts to promote coordination between SDAs and the welfare departments that administer the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program, and the divisions of the employment security and welfare agencies that administer the Work Incentive (WIN) and WIN Demonstration (WIN Demo) programs respectively, that are designed to get jobs for welfare recipients. For the most part, the literature is upbeat on this topic:

> Coordination with agencies which brought quick and concrete results, such as welfare and WIN, were generally successful.... SDAs for the most part developed good linkages with local welfare offices, ensuring a steady flow of applicants. (Walker 85)

However, as is illustrated in the following excerpt from an Urban Institute report, there is still room for improvement in terms of achieving many of the objectives of improved coordination, such as promotion of appropriate referrals:

> In two of the communities studied in detail and three others contacted by phone, ninety to ninety-five percent of the AFDC recipients who are referred to JTPA by the welfare department are reportedly rejected because they cannot meet the entry requirements for training. (Nightingale 85)

5.5 Coordination with Public Education Agencies

Despite the attention given to improving linkages between JTPA and secondary and post-secondary education agencies in the Act, this aspect of coordination has received less emphasis in the JTPA implementation literature than coordination with ES and welfare. This pattern appears to be changing, however, as a result of the passage of the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act, and a soon-to-be released study by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education at Ohio State University (Lewis 1987) should shed considerable light on this topic.

5.5.1 Modest Progress in Promoting Coordination

As illustrated in the following excerpts, the JTPA studies tend to agree that there have been at least modest improvements in this area:

Coordination with the public school system increased during the transitional period over what was set forth in the initial plans, primarily to increase the number of youth participating in JTPA. However, almost half of the SDAs still had no linkages with the public school system at the end of the transition period. (Walker 85)

The Carl Perkins Act amendments seem to be bringing about more cooperation at the State and local levels between JTPA and the vocational education agencies. (Cook 85A)

It appears to us that the emphasis on coordination in the Perkins and JTPA acts is causing more efforts to align programs and eliminate duplication... Early evidence of vocational education-JTPA coordination is also encouraging. In the fall of 1983 the National Alliance of Business surveyed all service delivery areas set up under JTPA. In 92 percent of these SDAs, public schools were being used to provide training. (Morgan Lewis in 8% hearings, 1985)

5.5.2 Effectiveness of the Eight Percent Set-Aside in Promoting Coordination

Several researchers report that the eight percent Title IIA education coordination set-aside has been having its intended effect in many states. As one of them puts it:

The strongest mechanism in either the Perkins Act or JTPA to foster coordination is the 8 percent set-aside of a State's Title II-A allocation under JTPA. Pritchard (1984) found that during the initial implementation period (November 1983 through January 1984) the twelve states she studied were working out organizational and administrative arrangements to accommodate the 8 percent as well as other facets of the new law. (Morgan Lewis in 8% hearings, 1985)

5.6 Coordination with Economic Development Agencies

With the exception of a series of publications of the National Governor's Association's State Employment, Training, and Economic Development Linkage Project, the JTPA implementation literature tends to emphasize the limited progress that has occurred in promoting coordination between JTPA and economic development activities.

5.6.1 Emphasizing the Positive

The above-cited NGA publications document the initial steps that states are taking to promote coordination between the employment and training and economic development systems, especially at the state level. As one of them puts it:

> Despite the history of separate and distinct agencies, many state officials are beginning to realize the common goals of employment, training, and economic development programs and are starting to improve the link between the two functions of government...
>
> Many states have acknowledged the need to coordinate their employment/ economic development programs and policies and have in fact made some successful attempts since the NGA's initial report in October 1983. (Balderston, 1985)

5.6.2 Evidence of Limited Progress

Despite the encouraging information noted in the preceding paragraphs, the remainder of the literature tends to stress the conclusion that there is still considerable room for improvement. The two most recent Westat studies document this lack of progress at the state level, and the Grinker-Walker team present a similar picture with respect to local level coordination:

> State emphasis on a link between JTPA and economic development is seemingly more rhetorical than real. In only a few States could a strong link between economic goals and JTPA programs be found.... In about half of the States, there are only weak links or none at all between JTPA and economic development efforts...In only a few States can a strong link be discerned between economic development goals and JTPA program parameters. (Cook 1985)
>
> Even in some States that were actively involved in economic development, JTPA was most often not a part of the "bag of tools" utilized by the State for economic development purposes. (Cook 85A)
>
> There continued to be great interest in coordination with local economic development efforts, but most SDAs saw this as a long-term process, and did not expect quick results. There was in fact little evidence of such results during the transition period. (Walker 85)

Even the relatively upbeat NGA studies note that:

> It is still early to fully appreciate the effects of these coordination efforts and there is still room for continued improvement as states gain experience and fine-tune their employment, training, and economic development programs and policies. (Balderston 1985)

This "room for improvement" includes the findings that only two (of 42) states required recipients of economic development funding to hire disadvantaged residents, three (of 47) states appointed of state job training or employment officials to serve on economic development advisory committees, and only 17 (of 45) states had SDAs that were coterminous with economic development districts.

5.7 Coordination with Vocational Rehabilitation

There are relatively few assessments of coordination with vocational rehabilitation agencies in the JTPA literature. Walker (85) found coordination with vocational rehabilitation (and vocational education) to be "scattered across the sites and usually modest in scope". On the other hand, the 1984 NAB survey found that 63% of the SDAs had linkages with vocational rehabilitation agencies, with most being non-financial in nature.

5.8 Coordination between Titles IIA and III

For the purposes of this study, the JTPA Title III dislocated worker program is being viewed as a related program with which the SDAs that are responsible for Title IIA can coordinate. The Westat studies of JTPA implementation are the primary source of information about inter-title coordination in the literature, and suggest that coordination is more likely to be meaningful when SDAs directly operate Title III programs. However, as a result of decisions made at the state level, most Title III programs are not run through SDAs.

The 1984 NAB survey and the Westat studies concur in concluding that SDAs are responsible for only a minority of the Title III activities, and that coordination between the two titles is enhanced where this does occur:

> The decision by some States to operate Title III as a statewide program and by others to fund specific Title III projects outside of the SDA delivery system for Title IIA may have hurt efforts to coordinate services of the two programs. (Cook 84)

> The level of communication and coordination remains low between the SDA-administered JTPA programs and the Title III programs operated by private, State, and local agencies outside of the SDA delivery system. (Cook 85)

> The bulk of the [Title III] funding goes to new program operators outside the State Service Delivery Area system. (Cook 85A)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

What are the policy and research implications of the findings presented in the report thus far? Answers to this question can be found in the concluding chapter.

Chapter Six

POLICY AND RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Introduction and Overview

It is impossible to assess the full policy implications of the material on SDA activities and coordination in this report without understanding the nature of the clients who participated, the labor markets they faced, and the outcomes that they achieved. However, this review of changes in Prime Sponsor/SDA activities and coordination from the last year of CETA to the first full years of JTPA does raise a number of important issues and questions which are summarized in this chapter.

Although this study has been carried out primarily to inform JTPA policy-makers and administrators, it has also yielded several lessons for the employment and training research community. In particular, it has demonstrated the value of two relatively unique methodologies, and has provided some guidance on ways that they can be best implemented. These lessons are also summarized below.

6.2 Policy Implications Relative to JTPA Activities

6.2.1 Increased Shares of Funding for CST and OJT

The framers of JTPA clearly intended to increase the emphasis on training activities as opposed to subsidized employment and supportive services. The SDAs that provided information on this issue demonstrate that the steps taken to promote this result have borne fruit. As is discussed in Chapter Two, these SDAs increased the proportion of their resources devoted to classroom vocational skills training courses (CST) and on-the-job training (OJT) by more than 25%. This, in turn, implies that the system might be amenable to similar efforts to reflect different priorities that may arise in the future.

6.2.2 Reductions on Cost per Participant

According to the SDAs that provided information on this topic, there were declines in overall cost per client following the transition from CETA to JTPA on the order of 20%, as well as equal or greater proportionate declines in cost per client in CST, OJT, remedial education, and year-round work experience for

in-school youth.

Given the generally observed improvements in outcomes following the transition to JTPA, these declines in cost per client can be explained in several different fashions. They may reflect greater efficiencies and/or they may reflect changes in measured or unmeasured client characteristics that make it easier to achieve desired outcomes for fewer resources. Obtaining a better understanding of the relative importance of these possibilities should be a key research issue in the future.

6.2.3 Shorter CST Courses and Shorter OJT Contracts

Perhaps as a reflection of efforts to reduce costs, SDAs are now delivering CST courses with an average of about three-fourths of the classroom hours as their CETA Prime Sponsor predecessors. There have also been declines in the average length of OJT contracts, with a 8.8% decline in the mean length and a 19.4% in median length.

These reductions may reflect conclusions that the CETA courses and OJT contracts were unnecessarily long, or that shorter courses and contracts were the only way of responding to the reduced funding and pressure to serve more clients for each dollar. Clarification of this issue, as well as obtaining data on who was served and the outcomes of these activities would both be helpful in efforts to draw policy-relevant conclusions.

6.2.4 Limited Changes in CST and OJT Occupations

The SDAs that provided detailed information on the subjects of CST courses and the occupations covered in OJT training slots indicated that there was relatively little change in the former, and only limited change in the latter. There are a range of conceivable explanations for this result, including: (a) CETA training was already directed at the appropriate occupations and no change was needed, (b) there is a segment of the market that has been traditionally a user of CETA trainees and it has been unnecessary or impossible to involve other types of employers, (c) there are few alternatives to the CETA training subjects or deliverers at the sites and therefore the changes in the planning process could not have had any major results, and/or (d) selection of CETA training deliverers and subjects has been a reflection of political influence or symbolic values that have not changed since the transition to JTPA.

Similar ranges of alternatives can be generated to explain the absence of change in emphasis on entry level positions in both CST and OJT, and the maintenance of an almost exclusive reliance on a 50% OJT subsidy. Efforts to understand the reasons that underlie these relatively small changes in the occupational focus of CST and OJT should help to clarify which alternative(s) seem most appropriate, as well as the policy implications of the findings.

6.2.5 Programming for Youth

The data on programming for youth presented in this paper raise an important concern, but also show considerable progress in a second area. The termination of CETA Title IV and the decline in the proportion of youth being served in activities specifically designed for youth (from 82.7% under CETA to 64.0% under JTPA) raise questions about the degree to which JTPA is meeting the unique needs of disadvantaged younger Americans. It is possible that programs designed for adults and youth can be responsive to the needs of youth, but further attention to this issue would appear to be warranted. As in many cases, it will take sophisticated analysis of program outcomes to determine whether this trend should be considered a cause for concern.

On the other hand, youth practitioners have long been advocating the development and implementation of competency measures to assess the progress of program participants. The sharp rise in the use of such measures over the period under study suggests that significant progress has been made in this area. Use of such measures is not yet universal, and it by no means obvious that the specific measures that are been adopted are necessarily the most appropriate. But the growth in use of such measures from none whatsoever during the final year of CETA to more than four-fifths of the activities (83.5%) in the median SDA in the second full year of JTPA stands out as one of the most positive developments covered in this report.

6.2.6 Increased Use of Performance-Based Contracts

Information provided by SDAs summarized in Chapter Two indicates that the use of performance-based contracts has now increased to the point where roughly half of them (50.0%) use this mechanism for all CST subcontractors and nearly a third (30.4%) use it for all other subcontracts. These significant increases in the utilization of performance-based contracts appear to be a reflection of the desire of the framers of JTPA to promote a system that rewards performance.

While the trends towards increased utilization of this mechanism seem favorable, firm conclusions cannot be reached without data on its impact on outcomes, and until attention is paid to the concerns of those who question whether this mechanism promotes pressures to "cream" and makes it more difficult for non-profit community-based organizations to compete for funding.

6.2.7 Employer Involvement

Analysis of changes in employer involvement in the design and administration of employment and training programs was hampered by the fact that only a single measure was included in the CETA phase of the study. However, the available data do not indicate an increase in the proportion of CST courses that were customized to meet the needs of a specific employer.

This, in turn, suggests that increasing the role of employer in planning programs by strengthening the role of the PIC does not automatically translate into increased responsiveness to the needs of specific employers or groups of employers. Given the central role accorded to the business community under JTPA, further analyses of changes in employer-involvement in CST courses and other aspects of JTPA programming would seem to be a fruitful area for future attention by policy-makers.

6.3 Policy Implications Relative to JTPA Coordination

The literature suggests that states can make an important difference in achievement of coordination at the local level, and there is evidence in the Westat studies that state efforts to promote coordination have increased over time. However, both the literature review and the panel study results suggest that there are clear limits as to what states can accomplish in getting agencies to coordinate at the local level, where there are vast differences in histories of relationships, interpersonal relationships, and other unique factors.

Therefore, at the risk of oversimplification, it appears as if the explanations for the presence or absence of coordination in JTPA contained in the literature closely resemble those in the CETA literature: SDAs and others coordinate when they find it in their mutual interest to do so, and there is limited progress at best when these mutual perceptions are not present. In essence, the results of the study thus highlight the difficulties inherent in promoting and maintaining increased coordination between employment and training and related public and private organizations. While changes in legislation at the Federal level and a variety of steps taken at the state level have undoubtedly been helpful in this regard, they have not been sufficient to overcome powerful barriers to coordination at the local level and thus insure the kinds of dramatic increases in coordination that employment and training professional have hoped for.

Funding cutbacks seem to have increased SDA awareness of the potential benefits of coordination with related agencies. But the results of the study suggest that neither the Federal nor the state support for coordination has been sufficient to convince large numbers of SDAs and other agencies that it is in both of their interests to take specific steps to promote coordination, and that coordination can help both of them to "look good" on whatever performance measures they may be using. Until they are convinced, rhetoric about the benefits of coordination will not be enough; once they are convinced, rhetoric will not be necessary.

6.4 Research Implications

6.4.1 The Value of the "Panel Study" Approach

The results of the study confirm the value of conducting studies that select a sample of Prime Sponsors/SDAs and obtain detailed information about them at several points in time. Social science researchers tracing poverty and welfare receipt have long recognized the value of panel studies such as the Michigan Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) over repeated cross-sectional studies of different individuals.

Reviews of the results of this study suggests that collection of detailed information from SDAs at two or more points in time has the same kind of advantages: a better ability to document change and determine the correlates of change, e.g., to answer the question, "What factors are most associated with individuals/SDAs that exhibit given kinds of change?"

The National Commission for Employment Policy's decision to fund this study represented a recognition of the benefits that could accrue to utilizing this approach. The results of the study show that the approach is both feasible and capable of being implemented at relatively modest levels of funding. In particular, when given generous amounts of time (up to six months), SDA staff have been willing to provide a relatively unprecedented amount of detail on the nature of the activities that they fund, the nature of their service delivery systems, and their efforts to coordinate with other agencies and programs.

The results that are reported in this paper are only scratching the surface of what can be accomplished with the data that have already been collected and entered into a computer. For example, the existing data base can be further mined to address such issues as the extent to which observed patterns vary according to size or type of SDA, continuity of key staff from CETA to JTPA, or the influence of the Private Industry Council in SDA decision-making.

In addition, if it were possible to add information about client characteristics, measured program outcomes, and local economic data to the data base, it would be possible to engage in relatively unprecedented analyses of the impact of changes in the design and delivery of programs. These examples are only illustrative; much more could be done.

Moreover, the value of the current research could be further enhanced by efforts to collect a third set of observations from the same SDAs, yielding an opportunity to trace changes in patterns over a period of time that goes beyond the CETA-JTPA transition period.

6.4.2 The Value of the Review Essay Approach

Strange as it may seem, the richness of the research literature on JTPA implementation has stood as a barrier to its optimum utilization. More than half a dozen major reports were produced by just two leading researchers groups, Westat, Inc., and the Grinker-Walker team. As a result of this vast volume of work, it is unlikely that more than a handful of researchers or policy-makers have had an opportunity to review them fully and to determine where they are in agreement and where they differ.

In retrospect, the review essay approach taken in this paper which juxtaposes the findings of the various studies on a topic by topic basis appears to be a promising way to make this wealth of material more accessible to both researchers and policy-makers, and to clarify areas of consensus and differences of opinion.

6.4.3 Enhancing the Effectiveness and Efficiency of the Two Approaches

The Panel Study Approach

Validating an approach does not mean that it cannot be done better in the future. Should efforts be made to replicate the panel-study approach, it would be wise to limit the scope of the inquiry and utilize the resources that are freed-up to conduct additional validation of information supplied by SDAs.

The decentralization that is the hallmark of JTPA appears to have greatly complicated the data collection task. Simply put, SDA planners and administrators often tend to interpret apparently straightforward terms in different ways, thereby raising issues of cross-site reliability. This study documents the different uses of such key terms as enrollment and termination, but the problems go beyond this. Does the information provided on PY 1984 Title IIA allocation include carry-ins? Do questions about the total numbers of youth served include participants in summer youth employment programs? Do SDAs have a common understanding of the term "community-based organization"? More generally, did anyone misunderstand an information request and fail to provide exactly what was expected?

Relatively few resources were available in this study to validate the material supplied by SDAs, and efforts to do so tended to increase the burden on the hard-pressed SDA officials that provided the information in the first place. Given this situation, it would appear desirable to engage in a trade-off that reduces information-collection burden on researchers and SDAs in return for increased ability to raise and resolve issues concerning interpretation of the data.

In conclusion, there is always a tendency to increase the scope of requests for information because there are so many interesting issues that could be studied and the incremental costs of adding a handful of items to the requests always seem slight. A review of the results of this study and the process of obtaining, tabulating, and analyzing the needed information tends to confirm the widely held opinion that these tendencies should be resisted.

The Review Essay Approach

Preparation of the review essays summarized in this report revealed several methodological issues that have not yet been fully resolved. The most important of these involves the degree to which conclusions about consensus or lack of consensus on each topic should be "documented" with extensive quotations from the studies that were reviewed. Efforts to do so resulted in a set of review essay of more than 100 pages. On the other hand, removal of the quotations would leave readers at the mercy of the reviewer with no independent means to check the basis for his or her conclusions.

The excerpts from the longer essay contained in this report represent an effort to arrive at a middle ground. However, further attention to the issues of documentation is needed in order to insure that the maximum benefits from the approach are attained.

Appendix A

SUMMARY OF COORDINATION REQUIREMENTS IN JTPA

AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR THIS STUDY

A.1 The General Mandate to Coordinate

The JTPA legislation mandates the creation of numerous mechanisms designed to insure that activities funded under the Act will be coordinated with other related programs and services. First, and perhaps foremost, State Governors are required to prepare a "Coordination and Special Services Plan" that will

> Establish criteria for coordinating activities under this Act with programs and services provided by State and local education and training agencies (including vocational education agencies, public assistance agencies, the employment service, rehabilitation agencies, post-secondary institutions, economic development agencies and such other agencies as the Governor determines to have a direct interest in employment and training and human resource utilization in the State. (Section 121 (b) (1))

Beyond this, all local job training plans for JTPA Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) are required to include a description of methods that will be used to comply with the Governor's plan (Section 104 (b)(7)), and Governors are required not to approve an SDA plan unless it complies with the criteria for coordination (Section 105 (b)(1)(E)).

In addition to this, the law states that funds provided under the Act shall not be used to duplicate facilities or services available in the area (with or without reimbursement from Federal, State, and local sources), unless it can be demonstrated that these alternative services would be more effective or more likely to achieve the service delivery area's performance goals.

A.2 Coordination with Specific Public Programs

This study focuses on coordination with the six public agencies that are extensively referenced in JTPA, and which should, therefore, be the focus of SDA efforts to improve coordination. The six are: the public Employment Service (ES), public welfare (or public assistance), vocational education, other public education agencies (including community colleges), economic development agencies, and vocational rehabilitation agencies.

All of the six are explicitly referenced in the above-cited discussion of the Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan (Section 121 (b)(1)), and all six are mentioned in the discussion of the required membership of the State Job Training Coordination Council (SJTCC) (Section 122 (a)(3)).

Five of the six agencies (all but public assistance) are addressed in the discussion of membership of local Private Industry Councils (PICs) (Section 102(b)), and four (all but ES and public education agencies) are mentioned in the mandate that the SJTCC assess the extent to which employment and training, vocational education, rehabilitation services, public assistance, economic development, and other Federal, state and local programs and services represent a consistent, integrated, and coordinated approach to meeting community needs (Section 122 (b)(7)(A)).

JTPA devotes additional explicit attention to relationships with the Employment Service, with welfare programs, and with education programs. Title V of the Act contains numerous amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act that are designed to improve coordination between ES and SDAs. Particularly noteworthy are the joint planning requirements (Section 501 (d)) at the local (SDA) as well as the state (SJTCC) levels.

Service to welfare recipients is highlighted in the Act through mandating of welfare dependency reduction measures in the JTPA performance standards (Section 106 (b)). Furthermore, the Act amends the authorizing legislation for the Work Incentive (WIN) program by requiring that, where appropriate, WIN registrants are to be referred for training and employment services under the Job Training Partnership Act and by making other changes to bring the WIN planning system closer to that employed under JTPA. Finally, the Act mandates that WIN registrants be served on an "equitable basis" (Section 203 (b)(3)).

For these reasons, the discussion of coordination in this report addresses two distinct elements of coordination with welfare programs: general coordination with public assistance agencies, and specific coordination with WIN programs (or the WIN Demonstration or "WIN Demo" programs that have replaced WIN in many states).

Efforts in the Act to promote coordination with education programs center on the 8% set-aside for cooperative agreements with State (and where appropriate local) education agencies (Sections 123, and 202 (b)(1)), and the requirement that appropriate education agencies be provided the opportunity to provide educational services unless there are alternates that are demonstrated to be more effective (Section 107(c)).

Coordination with the Private Sector

Although JTPA contains numerous specific references to improved coordination with publicly funded programs, the overall thrust of the Act has been to promote close links between the employment and training system and private employers. This intention is made concrete by mandating the co-equal role of the private sector in the Private Industry Councils (PICs) with local elected officials to oversee program planning and operation in local SDAs. The Act requires that representatives of the private sector constitute a majority of the membership of the PICs; that the chairman of the PICs be chosen from this group (Sections 102 (a) and (b)); and that the representatives of the private sector constitute at least a third of the state-level SJTCC (Section 122 (a)(2)).

Given this general thrust in the JTPA legislation, this study has also therefore focused on Prime Sponsor efforts to coordinate their activities with private employers. In addition, it also examines coordination with private for-profit deliverers of training services, i.e. proprietary schools.

Appendix B

DETAILED STUDY METHODOLOGY

B.1 Derivation of Measures of Coordination

The measures of coordination employed in the study were developed through a review of the CETA and pre-CETA research literature as well as studies of coordination in other human service programs, and through conversations with employment and training researchers and practitioners. In particular, three types of measures have been utilized:

- Assessments of the current and past levels of coordination made by high level CETA/JTPA staff;
- Assessment of the extent to which structures and planning procedures to promote coordination are in place, such as
  - --Input from other agencies into the CETA/JTPA planning process, and
  - --Periodic meetings between the Prime Sponsor/SDA and other agencies, and
  - --Institution of umbrella agencies that have authority over both the Prime Sponsor/SDA and the (public) agencies addressed in this study; and
- Assessment of the extent to which operational mechanisms to promote the desired results of coordination have been implemented, such as
  - --Formal client referral agreements,
  - --Collocation of offices, and
  - --Agreements in which both CETA/JTPA and another agency jointly fund programs.

Review of the literature and discussions with CETA researchers and practitioners resulted in a decision to obtain information along each of these three dimensions in order to describe and analyze the relationships between Prime Sponsors and nine agencies and/or programs:

- The Work Incentive (WIN) and/or WIN Demonstration (WIN Demo) programs,

- The public Employment Service (ES) other than the ES components responsible for WIN,
- Agencies responsible for public welfare other than the welfare agency components responsible for WIN Demo,
- Agencies responsible for vocational education,
- Public education agencies other than those responsible for vocational education,
- Proprietary schools,
- Economic development agencies,
- Agencies responsible for vocational rehabilitation, and
- Private employers.

B.2 Details of Phase I Study Activities

A stratified random sample of fifty Prime Sponsors was drawn in order to develop estimates of the levels, mechanisms, and results of coordination that could be reasonably extrapolated to the "typical Prime Sponsor" in the country as a whole. Directors of the selected Prime Sponsors (or their designees) were contacted in August, 1983, in order to describe the study and to obtain commitments to provide information. All fifty expressed a willingness to do so, and all were sent materials that described the measures of coordination to be employed in the study.

Information concerning the FY 83 status of coordination was obtained from Prime Sponsor officials during the months of September, October, November, and December of 1983; and January, February, and March of 1984. Useful information was obtained from 45 of the 50 randomly selected Prime Sponsors by the early April deadline for inclusion in the report, yielding a response rate of 90%. The subsample of forty-five Prime Sponsors providing information for the baseline report was, for the most part, representative of the fifty Prime Sponsor random sample and the universe of Prime Sponsors as a whole.

B.3 Details of Phase II Study Activities

The second phase of the study began with efforts to determine which JTPA service delivery areas most closely corresponded to the jurisdictions served by the fifty Prime Sponsors. Initial contacts were made with state level JTPA officials, and confirming telephone calls with SDA officials themselves. As is shown in Exhibit 1-1 in Chapter 1, it was determined that fifty-one (51) SDAs represent the closest possible match to the fifty former prime sponsorships.

The exhibit also shows that 32 of the SDAs represent perfect matches, SDAs whose boundaries and jurisdictions are identical to former prime sponsorships. This represents just under two-thirds of the cases. The other one-third represent a variety of circumstances. For example, two of the study Prime Sponsors and another combined to form a single SDA; one Prime Sponsor split into two separate SDAs; another gave up a substantial portion of its jurisdiction to a nearby Prime Sponsor when both became SDAs. In several, a balance of county Prime Sponsor has incorporated the city that had previously been a separate entity.

Data collection for Phase II replicated the activities undertaken for the previous study. SDA officials were contacted and requests were made for precisely the same information that was addressed for the CETA study, along with additional JTPA-specific information. Descriptions of coordination were requested for the "current period", i.e., Program Year 1985, the twelve month period that began July 1, 1985 and is scheduled to end June 30, 1986.

As was the case in Phase I, all SDA officials who were contacted agreed to provided the needed information. Data were obtained from these officials during the months of November and December of 1985, and January through May of 1986. A total of forty-five of the SDAs provided useful information for the study by the mid-May, 1986 deadline, representing an 88% response rate. (Additional responses are still expected and will be incorporated into the revised final report.)

The descriptors of JTPA activities and the JTPA service delivery system were almost always identical to those used in the prior CETA study. Given the complexity of the term coordination, a wide variety of measures were employed. Three subjective assessments of coordination were utilized along with thirty-three objective measures, most of which apply to each of the nine agencies included in this study, resulting in considerably more than 300 separate data points for each SDA.

The data were coded, entered into an IBM Personal Computer, and analyzed using SPSS/PC by SPSS Inc. Draft reports for the activities and coordination studies were prepared and submitted in February 1987 and June 1986 respectively. This report incorporates comments received from NCEP staff.

Appendix C

SOURCES CONSULTED

Alegria, Fernando L., Jr., and Jose Figueroa, "Study of the JTPA Eight Percent Education Coordination and Grants Set-Aside and the Three Percent Set-Aside Training Program for Older Individuals", (Washington, D.C.: Center for Policy Research and Analysis of the National Governors' Association), March 1986

Angrisani, Albert, "Testimony before the Subcommittee on Manpower and Housing, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatatives" July 14, 1983

Bailis, Lawrence N., "Study of the Status of FY 83 CETA Coordination and Program Activities--Final Report: Coordination Study", (Washington: National Commission for Employment Policy, May, 1984)

Bailis, Lawrence N., "Study of the Status of FY 83 CETA Coordination and Program Activities--Final Report: Activities Study", (Washington: National Commission for Employment Policy, June, 1984)

Bailis, Lawrence Neil, "What's Happening to CBOS under JTPA and Where Do We Go from Here? Highlights of the National Youth Employment Coalition Survey" (New York: National Youth Employment Coalition, June, 1984)

Balderston, Kris, "Inventory of State Actions to Coordinate State Programs and Policies--State Employment, Training, and Economic Development Linkage Project" (Washington, D.C.: Center for Policy Research and Analysis of the National Governor's Association), September, 1985

Ball, Joseph, "Strategic Planning Considerations for the Job Training Partnershp Act Program in Cleveland and Cuyahoga County (New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, April, 1985)

Bloom, Howard, "The Effect of Eliminating Allowances from CETA Training Programs: Some Preliminary Findings" (Washington: National Commission for Employment Policy, 1984)

Brady, Elaine, et al, "What's Happening with JTPA? A Complete Analysis of NAB's 1984 Survey Data" (Washington: National Alliance of Business, 1985)

Brady, Elaine, et al, ""Is the Job Training Partnership Act Working? The 1985 NAB Survey of PIC Chairs and SDA Administrators" (Washington: National Alliance of Business, 1986)

Brown, Larry, "Community-Based Organizations: The Challenges of the Job Training Partnership Act", (New York: National Youth Employment Coalition, May, 1984)

Business Working Group for Human Resources, "State Policy Directions under the Job Training Partnership Act: A Business Perspective" January, 1983

Carlson, Burton, "Barriers and Opportunities for Linking Programs and Policies" (Washington: National Governors' Association Center for Policy Research and Analysis, September, 1985)

Center for Human Resources at Brandeis University and National Association of Private Industry Councils, Youth Programs (various issues)

Cook, Robert, et al, "Early Service Delivery Area Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act" (Rockville, MD: Westat, 1984)

Cook , Robert, Wayne Turnage, and Associates, "The Title IIIK Dislocated Worker Program" in Industrial Relations Research Series: Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Annual Meeting (December 28-30, 1984)

Cook, Robert, et al, "Transition Year Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act" (Rockville, MD: Westat, 1985)

Cook, Robert, et al, "Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act: Final Report" (Rockville, MD: Westat, 1985)

Comptroller General of the United States, "Job Training Partnership Act: Initial Implementation of Program for Disadvantaged Youth and Adults" (Washington: General Accounting Office, March 4, 1985)

Comptroller General of the United States, "The Job Training Partnership Act: An Analysis of Support Cost Limits and Participant Characteristics" (Washington, General Accounting Office, November 6, 1985)

Comptroller General of the United States, "Job Training Partnership Act: Data Collection Efforts and Needs" (Washington: General Accounting Office, March, 1986)

Dement, Edward and R.C. Smith, "Taking Charge: A Report on the States' First Year Experiences under JTPA" (Chapel Hill, NC: MDC, Inc., August 1984)

Dement, Edward F., "Final Report: State Job Training Coordinating Councils", (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: MDC, Inc., May 1985)

Director, Steven and Stepehn Schneider, "Short-term Evaluation and 1982--Impact of Different Forms of Private Sector Participation on Client Characteristics and Program Outcomes: Final Report" (Washington: CSR, Inc., 1983)

Fogel, Richard, "STatement before the Subcommitteee on Employment Opportunitites of the House Committee on Education and Labor on GAO's Work Relating to the Job Training Partnershp Act", (Washington: General Accounting Office, May 2, 1985

Gainer, William, "Statement of William Gainer before the Subcomittee on Employemnt Opportutnies of the House Committee on Education and Labor on the Job Training Partnership Act, Title III Dislocated Worker Program", (Washington: General Acounting Office, November 8, 1985)

Gainer, William, "Statement before the Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources on the Job Training Partnership Act Performance Standards and Information Systems", (Washington: General Accounting Office, March 11, 1986)

Haulman, Clyde, Frederick Raffa and Brian Rungling, "Florida's JTPA Experience: Preliminary Observations" in Industrial Relations Research Series: Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Annual Meeting (December 28-30, 1984)

Hunt, H. Allen, Kalman Rupp, and Associates, "The Implementation of Title IIA of JTPA in States and Service Delivery Areas: The New Partnership and Progress Directions" in Industrial Relations Research Series: Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Annual Meeting (December 28-30, 1984)

Illinois Unemployment and Job Training Research Project, "The Federal Budget and Shriking Resources for Job Training", (Chicago: University of Chicago, March 18, 1985)

Interstate Conference of Employment Secuirty Agencies, Inc., "Meeting the Legislative Challenge: A Status Report on Employment Security and the Job Training Partnership Act Coordination", March 1985

Jackson, Mary and Sally Coberly, "Older Workers and the Job Training Partnership Act: A Survey and Case-Study Analysis of the 3 Percent Set-Aside Programs" (Los Angeles, CA: National Policy Center on Employemnt and Retirement of the Andrus Gerontology Ceter, University of South California, July, 1985)

Jolly, Elton, "Program Effects of JTPA on Community-Based Organizations", (New York: National Youth Employment Coalition, June, 1984)

Ketron, Inc., "Coordination among CETA and Other Federal Programs Providing Employment, Trianing, and Income Support", (Washington: National Commission for Employment Policy, October 30, 1981)

Lewis, Morgan et al., "Vocational Education-JTPA Coordination: First Annual Report", (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University National Center for Research in Vocational Education, forthcoming in Spring 1987)

Little, Milton, et al, "The Federal Response to Youth Unemployment: Too Little for Too Few: A Report on the Effects of the Job Training Partnership Act on Youth Employment Perograms in New York City" (New York City: INTERFACE, May 1985)

MDC, Inc., "Tracking the Transition--Summary and Analysis: Early State-Level Preparations for JTPA Implementation" (Chapel Hill, NC: author, December 1982)

MDC, Inc. "Tracking the Transition (Round Two)--A Report on the Status of State and Local Preparations for Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act", (Chapel Hill, NC: author, August, 1983)

National Alliance of Business in conjunction with the National Governors' Association, "Youth Employment Competencies: A Systemwide Survey of the Current Status, Problem Areas, and Recommendations for Training and Technical Assistance" (Washington: authors, January 1985)

National Association of State Units on Aging, "Coordinating JTPA 3% Set-Aside and the Senior Community Service Employment Program," (Washington: author, February 20, 1986)

National Commission for Employment Policy, "Older Workers: Prospects, Problems, and Policies: Ninth Annual Report" (Washington: author, 1985)

National Council of La Raza, "A Review of the Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act: The Implications of the Grinker-Walker Report for Hisapanics", July, 1984

National Governors' Association, "Coordinating Job Training and Public Assitance Functions" (Washington: author, July 1983)

National Governors' Association, "Managing the Six Percent Set-Aside" (Washington: author, December, 1983)

National Governors' Association, "Managing the Ten Percent Set-Aside" (Washington: author, December 1983)

National Governors' Association, "Survey of the States: A Report on the Status of State Level Administration of the Job Training Partnership Act" (Washington: author, April 1984)

National Governors' Association, "Analysis of Coordination Criteria in the Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan" (Washington: author, May 1984)

National Governors' Association, "Report on a Meeting on Implementation of Title III of JTPA Held in Washington, D.C. April, 1984" (Washington: author, June 6, 1984)

National Governors' Association, "Assessment of Adult and Youth Performancer Standards under the Job Training Partnership Act", (Washington: author, November 1985)

Nightingale, Demetra Smith and Carolyn Taylor O'Brian, "Community-Based Organizations in the Job Training Partnership Act (Washington: The Urban Institute, October 1984)

Nightingale, Demertra Smith, "Federal Employment and Training Policy Changes during the Reagan Adminsitration: State and Local Responses" (Washington: The Urban Institute, May 1985)

Reesman, Cilla et al, "Coordination and Cooperation between SCSEP and CETA Operations" (Rockville, MD: Westat, 1983)

Richardson, Philip, et al, "Assessment of the Implementation and Effects of the JTPA Title V Wagner-Peyser Amendments: Phase I Final Report (Silver Spring, MD: Macro Systems, Inc., January 1985)

Sklar, Morton, (ed.) Jobs Watch Alert (Washington: Center for National Policy Review, various dates)

Solow, Katherine, "The Job Training Partnership Act Service to Women" (New York: Grinker Walker and Associates, 1986)

Trego, Nancy Remine, "Program Design Options for Non-Stipended Programs" (Washington: National Commission for Employment Policy, February 1984)

U.S. Conference of Mayors, "The CETA/Vocational Education Working "Relationship: A Status Report on the Perceptions of CETA and Vocational Education Administrators" in National Commission for Employment Policy, "The Federal Role in Vocational Education: Sponsored Research" (Washington: author, November 1981)

U.S. Congress, "Job Training Partnership Act" (P.L. 97-300, October 13, 1982)

U.S. Department of Labor, Division of Performance Management and Evaluation, "Summary of JTPA Administrative Data from the JASR/JQSR System for the Transition Year" (Washington: author, November 1984)

U.S. Department of Labor, Division of Performance Management and Evaluation, "HIghlights of JTPA Program Performance for Titles IIA and III during the JTPA Transition Year" (Washington: author, November 1984)

U.S. Department of Labor, Division of Performance Management and Evaluation, "Summary of JTLS Data for JTPA Title IIA and III Enrollments and Terminations during October--December, 1984" (Washington: author, May 1985)

U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Development, "Management Summary: Summary of JTLS Data for JTPA Title IIA and III Enrollments and Terminations during October--December, 1984" (Washington: author, May, 1985)

U.S. Department of Labor, Dvision of Perofrmance mangement and Evaluation, "Highlights of JTPA Program Performance for Ttiles IIA and III During JTPA Program Year 1984" (Washington: author, November 1985)

U.S. Department of Labor, Division of Perofrmance Management and Evaluation, "Summary of JTLS Data for JTPA Title IIA Enrollements and Terminations during Program year 1984" (Washington: author, November 1985)

U.S. House of Representatives, Committeee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, "Oversight Hearing on the Job Training Partnership Act (Part 1), May 2, 1985

U.S. House of Representatives, Committeee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, "Oversight Hearing on the Job Training Partnership Act (Part 2), June 28, 1985

U.S. House of Representatives, Committeee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, "Oversight Hearing on the Job Training Partnership Act (Part 3), November 8, 1985

U.S. House of Representatives, Committeee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, "Oversight Hearing on the Department of Labor's Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act", October 10, 1985

U.S. House of Representatives, Committeee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, "The 8 Percent Section of the Job Training Partnership Act", December 7, 1985 ("Eight Percent Hearings 1985")

U.S. House of Representatives, Committeee on Government Operations, "Thirteenth Report: Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act and OMB Interference" November 3, 1983.

U.S. House of Representatives, Committeee on Government Operations, "Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act and OMB Interference" November 8, 1983

U.S. House of Representatives, Committeee on Government Operations, "Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act" July and August 1983

U.S. House of Representatives, Committeee on Government Operations, "Hearing: Federal Job Training Partnership Act for Veterans", April 25, 1985

U.S. House of Representatives, Committeee on Government Operations, "Hearing: Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act", July 12, 14, and August 2, 1983.

U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, "Preliminary Oversight on the Job Training Partnership Act" December 1984

U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity, "Hearings: Oversight on the Job Training Partnership Act" July 1,2 and August 7, 1985.

U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity, "Hearing: Oversight--Job Training Partnership Act" July 12, 1984

U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity, "Committeee Print: Preliminary Oversight on the Job Training Parternsip Act", December 1984.

Walker, Gary, et al, "An Independent Sector Assessment of the Job Training Partnership Act--Phase I: The Initial Transition" (New York: Grinker, Walker, and Associates, et al, March 1984)

Walk er, Gary, et al, "An Independent Sector Assessment of the Job Training Partnership Act--Phase I: The Initial Implementation" (New York: Grinker, Walker, and Associates, et al, Jnauary 1985)

Walker, Gary, et al, "An Independent Sector Assessment of the Job Training Partnership Act--Final Report" (New York: Grinker, Walker, and Associates, et al, August 1986)

Wallace, John, "Information Collection for the Job Training Partnership Act: Performance Standards vs Evaluation", unpublished paper, 1984

Westat, Inc., "Job Training Longitudinal Survey--Technical Paper: Summary Description of JTLS STudy Design" (Rockville, MD: author, September 1984)

Zornitsky, Jeff, et al, "Post-Program Perfgormance Measures for Adult Programs Funded under Titles IIA and III of JTPA: Early Findings Prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor's Performance Standards Advisory Committee" (Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, June 1985)